

# The Biblical Review

## QUARTERLY

PUBLISHED BY  
THE BIBLICAL SEMINARY IN NEW YORK  
WILBERT W. WHITE, *President*

ROBERT M. KURTZ, *Editor*

*Associate Editors:*

WILBERT W. WHITE      LOUIS MATTHEWS SWEET      ALBERT CLARKE WYCKOFF

PUBLICATION OFFICE, 36 BEAVER STREET, ALBANY, NEW YORK  
EDITORIAL AND EXECUTIVE OFFICE, 541 LEXINGTON AVENUE, NEW YORK, N. Y.

*The general diffusion of the Bible is the most effectual way  
to civilize and humanize mankind.*—CHANCELLOR KENT.

Vol. X                      APRIL, 1925                      No. 2

### CONTENTS

|                                                                         | PAGE |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| EDITORIAL . . . . .                                                     | 165  |
| “RACHEL WEEPING FOR HER CHILDREN”<br>HENRY CHAPMAN SWEARINGEN . . . . . | 170  |
| THE HASMONAEANS AND HEROD THE IDUMAEAN<br>E. G. SIHLER . . . . .        | 197  |
| THE RE-CREATING OF THE INDIVIDUAL<br>ROBERT P. WILDER . . . . .         | 223  |
| THE NEW WORLD OF ISLAM. SAMUEL M. ZWEMER . . . . .                      | 232  |
| THE REVIEW. CURRENT THOUGHT AND ACTIVITY. BOOKS . . . . .               | 246  |

THE PRICE OF THE BIBLICAL REVIEW IS TWO DOLLARS a year, prepaid in American territory, in Canada, Mexico, and Samoa. For all other countries, add thirty cents postage. Single copies, fifty cents. REMITTANCES should be sent by draft on New York, Express Order, or Money Order, payable to THE BIBLICAL REVIEW. Receipt of subscription is included with subscriber's address on each copy. CHANGE OF ADDRESS. For change, give both old and new addresses. SUBSCRIPTIONS should be sent to the Publication Office, 36 Beaver Street, P. O. Box 495, Albany, N. Y., or the Executive Office, 541 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y., as indicated above.

Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office at Albany, New York, October 14, 1920, under the Act of August 24, 1912.  
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized.  
Copyright 1925, by The Biblical Seminary in New York.

# THE BIBLICAL SEMINARY IN NEW YORK

WILBERT W. WHITE, *President*

## *Summer Term, June 17—July 28, 1925*

Strong courses in the English Bible, Biblical and Modern Psychology, Pedagogy, Sociology, Sunday School Work, Phonetics, and Evangelistic Methods. Special attention is also given to the discussion of problems peculiar to the various Mission Fields.

### COURSES FOR PASTORS

Since 1921 approximately two hundred pastors in active service have taken the special courses outlined for them in the Summer Term. Similar courses will be offered July 1-July 28.

### ARRANGEMENT OF COURSES

The full term of six weeks is divided into two periods of three weeks each, June 17-July 7 and July 8-July 28. Major subjects require two hours' recitation daily, except Saturdays and Sundays, for three weeks. Minor subjects one hour daily.

Each period is complete in itself, and yet the work of the whole term is co-ordinated and progressive.

### SPECIAL AUGUST-SEPTEMBER PROGRAM

The Biblical Seminary is in its twenty-fifth year. Its opening day was January 8, 1901, in Montclair, New Jersey.

One special feature of the year completing its first quarter-century is to be an August-September program at an attractive lakeside. The following will characterize this new summer center:

Freedom from crowds.

An uncrowded program.

Restricted registration.

Ample provision for rest and recreation.

Intensive, illustrative short courses in Bible study.

Emphasis on Method in study and in teaching.

Inspirational addresses.

Informal conferences on Christian life and service.

Response to special personal and group needs as discovered and made known at the time.

For full information, address

JOHN ANDERSON WOOD, *Dean*,

541 Lexington Avenue

New York



# THE CONTRIBUTORS

The publishers of THE BIBLICAL REVIEW are proceeding on the principle that a thorough and constructive scholarship, of a sound Christian character, has an important mission today.

This quarterly's articles are solid and informing. So far as possible the controversial spirit is avoided.

A generous amount of space is devoted to numerous brief extracts from current literature, with comments, and to comprehensive reviews of important new books—the sort of literary news the preacher and the Christian leader appreciate.

This partial list of writers sufficiently guarantees its contributed articles:

DR. G. CAMPBELL MORGAN.  
DR. HENRY CHAPMAN SWEARINGEN, St. Paul, Minn.  
PROFESSOR DAVID S. CAIRNS, United Free Church College, Aberdeen.  
PROFESSOR A. G. HOGG, Madras College, India.  
REV. R. BIRCH HOYLE, Baptist Pastor and Writer, England.  
DR. ROBERT E. SPEER, Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions.  
DR. ALBERT CLARKE WYCKOFF, Specialist in Religious Psychology.  
BISHOP W. F. OLDHAM, Methodist Episcopal Church.  
PROFESSOR JAMES H. SNOWDEN, Western Theological Seminary.  
PROFESSOR A. T. ROBERTSON, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.  
DR. CLARENCE E. MACARTNEY, Presbyterian Pastor, Philadelphia.  
PRINCIPAL JOHN McNICOL, Toronto Bible College.  
DR. HARMON H. McQUILKIN, Presbyterian Pastor, Orange, N. J.  
PROFESSOR GEORGE STIBITZ, Central Theological Seminary.  
DR. JUNIUS B. REMENSNYDER, New York.  
DR. ANDREW GILLIES, Methodist Pastor and Writer.  
PROFESSOR WALTER L. LINGLE, Union Theological Seminary (Richmond).  
DR. CHARLES L. GOODELL, Federal Council of Churches.  
MR. ROBERT P. WILDER, General Secretary, Student Volunteer Movement.  
DR. J. E. H. THOMSON, Lecturer, University of Glasgow.  
REV. MILES H. KRUMBINE, Pastor First Lutheran Church, Dayton, O.  
PROFESSOR ADOLF DEISSMANN, Berlin.  
PROFESSOR E. G. SIHLER, New York University.  
PROFESSOR WILLIAM M. MCPHEETERS, Columbia Theological Seminary.  
PROFESSOR JOHN A. FAULKNER, Drew Theological Seminary.  
PROFESSOR GEERHARDUS VOS, Princeton Theological Seminary.  
DR. HARRIS E. KIRK, Presbyterian Pastor, Baltimore, Md.  
PROFESSOR LOUIS MATTHEWS SWEET, The Biblical Seminary.  
PROFESSOR JOHN R. SAMPEY, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.  
MR. P. WHITWELL WILSON, Journalist, author *The Christ We Forget*.  
PROFESSOR J. M. T. WINTHER, Lutheran Seminary, Kumamoto, Japan.  
PROFESSOR ROBERT DICK WILSON, Princeton Theological Seminary.  
PROFESSOR JOHN H. RAVEN, New Brunswick Theological Seminary.  
REV. E. M. MARTINSON, Baptist pastor, Delphi, Ind.  
REV. T. H. WRIGHT, Scots Church, Paris, Art and Literary Critic.

**TWO DOLLARS A YEAR**

Religion and more religion are  
the security against the menace  
arising from the determination  
of mankind to be unshackled.

—HENRY CHAPMAN SWEARINGEN,  
in this issue.



# THE BIBLICAL REVIEW

## QUARTERLY

---

Vol. X

APRIL, 1925

No. 2

---

### EDITORIAL

ONE OF THE MOST SERIOUS PROBLEMS OF THE CHURCH is, how to keep the members that it gains. A second one, of nearly or quite the same magnitude, is, how to bring into the church the children of Christian families.

Dr. Henry Chapman Swearingen, former Moderator of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, writes a paper on both losses from membership, under the caption, "Rachel Weeping for Her Children." However, he dismisses the loss of actual members with a few words and devotes himself chiefly to the problem, "Why the church does not make an appeal to large numbers of its own children sufficiently effective to draw them into its communion." While the church is still recruited largely from Christian homes and is just now growing faster numerically than the population of this country, yet vast numbers of young people from church families remain outside its ranks.

The question demands the most serious study, and Dr. Swearingen has evidently devoted no little attention to it. He first discusses various contributing causes for this state of affairs in the church, showing that no single one is wholly responsible; still, he puts forward as especially throwing light on the situation: The genius of Protestantism, the growing spirit of liberty, the

nature of conversion, and intermarriages. When it comes to the matter of remedy, the writer suggests as of major importance: A quickened sense of family solidarity, a truer conception of the nature and office of the church, better co-operation between home and church, a new realization that religion is a comprehensive and controlling factor in life, an education in Christianity, and a new stress on conversion.

IN JULY, 1922, WE COMPLETED IN THIS QUARTERLY A series of noteworthy studies upon the general theme of the conflict between Christianity and classic paganism, covering the early centuries of our era. These papers, by Professor E. G. Sihler, now emeritus, of New York University, attracted considerable attention among scholars interested in the period covered, and in 1923 they were brought out in book form in England, by the Cambridge University Press. The volume has received a most gratifying reception, not only in England but on the Continent and elsewhere on the part both of distinguished individual readers and of the press.

After spending a good portion of last year in further study in Europe, Dr. Sihler has returned to this country and is devoting himself to special research with respect to New Testament times and text. In this issue, under the caption, *The Hasmonaeans and Herod the Idumaeans*, he traces the development of events in Jewish history from the end of the Exile until the time of Christ.

As in all his work of this character, the author has reread in the original the historians consulted—Josephus, Polybius, I and II Maccabees, Strabo—and the character and trustworthiness of these writers have been taken into account, as well as the statements they make.



For this careful assessment of the accuracy of these early historians, Dr. Sihler's long familiarity with the history, language, and writers of the classic period has admirably fitted him.

New Testament students will have a fresh interest in Herod and his contemporaries after enjoying such a summary of a most important era of Jewish history as we have here. Dr. Sihler hopes to follow this with further material on the same general line, his next subject being The Older Diaspora.

THE TENDENCY IN RECENT YEARS TO TREAT HUMANITY collectively, whether as an object of study, of benevolence or of exploitation, seems to be approaching its culmination. The individual would appear about to emerge once more from the mass. We find evidence of this in the industrial as well as in the social and religious worlds. This might have been expected, for there is an inherent disposition in human nature to demand individual recognition and rights, and to resent the submerging of personality.

A most serious blunder of recent Christian propaganda has been its overemphasis upon the social aspect of humanity. Man has his social nature with its laws and possibilities, but, in their greatest interests and relationships, men must be dealt with as individuals. The Lord does not save all in any race, nation, class, church or other group because of their high average in faith and character any more than a university gives every man a degree because their class standing as a whole has been very creditable. There is a social Gospel, and it should not be neglected, but human society is not going to be eternally redeemed *en masse*. Salvation remains a matter between the individual and his Lord.

Mr. Robert P. Wilder, of the Student Volunteer Movement, through his years of work among students, has had exceptional opportunity to see the importance of this truth. He testifies briefly respecting both the principle and its application, under the heading, *The Re-creating of the Individual*. After a brief resumé of the history of the social service movement, he passes to the effect of the Great War upon it and to present conditions. Then he takes up concretely the results of his long experience, showing that, "The swing of the pendulum is away from the collective problem to the sense of personal need." Quotations from letters add force to his words. While his paper is brief, it presents a very clear cut and positive testimony to the vital and supreme importance of the much despised personal salvation.

THE TWO GREAT AGGRESSIVE RELIGIONS OF THE WORLD are Christianity and Mohammedanism. For centuries they have faced each other, with varying fortunes, in Asia, Africa, and the Near East. The Western Christian world has in late years been hearing much of the vigorous propaganda of Islam, particularly in Africa where it would almost seem that the followers of the Prophet were about to take religious possession of great regions by making their inhabitants Moslems.

However, adverse forces have lately been at work within the body of Mohammedanism itself, and they have wrought changes that we of the West have scarcely been aware of. As a result the Christian church faces a new situation along its Mohammedan front, and it is with this that Dr. Zwemer deals in *The New World of Islam*. The Great War let loose in that world ideas and ideals that have threatened, if they have not actually accomplished, the disruption of a united Islam, as he



shows at the outset. The great significance of the recent abolition of the office of Caliph and the banishment of the last of the Caliphs and their immediate results are pointed out. Loyal Moslem leaders are looking with pessimistic forebodings on the crumbling of their once solid bulwarks.

As Dr. Zwemer shows, this state of affairs has been brought about largely since the war closed. He quotes Mohammedan writers to show how profound has been the disturbance and the apprehension felt for the future. Though Islam is now found on all the continents, it is broken by sects and no longer opposes to Christianity its ancient almost impenetrable defenses. Five distinct aspects of this change are enumerated.

For Christians the fact of outstanding importance is, that God has been moving in these events to make a breach in the Moslem walls for the entrance of the Gospel of Christ. We have published few articles that have been so solemnly cheering for the church as is this one, for "a great and effectual door has been opened," and that suddenly. How will the church meet this vast opportunity?

THE CRITICS OF THE SEVEN BOOKS REVIEWED IN THE present issue seem to have given rather unusual care to their discussion of the volumes dealt with. The list includes:

The Modern Use of the Bible.—Fosdick.

John Henry Jowett, C. H., M. A., D. D.—Porritt.

The Christ of the Logia.—Robertson.

Nineteenth Century Evolution and After.—Dawson.

The Biblical Idea of God.—Thomas.

Personality and Psychology.—Buckham.

Baron Paul Nicolay.—Langenskjöld.

R. M. K.

## “RACHEL WEEPING FOR HER CHILDREN”

By REV. HENRY CHAPMAN SWEARINGEN, D. D., LL. D.

MUCH has been written about leakage from church membership. In these inquiries principal emphasis has been placed on the tendency to drop out of church relations and activities after once having assumed them. There is, however, another element in this problem which perhaps, has not received the attention it deserves, namely, the loss through children of church families failing to become members at all. The first is a loss from *actual* membership, the second a loss from *potential* membership.

It would be difficult to decide which of the two is the more serious; probably a safe guess would be the second. Unfortunately statistics are not available in either instance. Reports from churches are notoriously inaccurate, and, even though the figures might be relied upon for general conclusions, yet methods of admitting members, of keeping membership records, and of pruning the rolls vary so widely that any attempt to arrive at approximately accurate numerical results would be almost a hopeless undertaking.

One who tries to get to the heart of this problem must depend more or less upon general impressions. It is to be regretted that no truly scientific study of the subject has ever been made. It awaits the care and patience of some scholar, or perhaps a group of scholars, who can appreciate the value of such an investigation and can make the required contribution of time and



technical knowledge. Doubtless there lie hidden in the mazes of "suspended rolls" and "reserved lists," in records of those "dropped" from membership, and in "baptismal registers," not to mention the thousands of instances unrecorded, humbling facts which the church needs to know.

But even with this information at hand, little light would be thrown upon the second phase of our problem, viz: the number of children born into Christian families, who have never sought the communion of the church. For of all church lists, the registers of baptisms and, particularly, of births are admittedly the most incomplete. True, this statement does not apply equally to all denominations of Christians, but it is a general criticism which lies against most of them. In considering the subject, therefore, we are restricted almost entirely to a general knowledge of church conditions. But this limitation should not deter us from facing facts too patent to be ignored. Any one with but meager experience in church administration must be convinced that the wastage from normal resources of membership in the churches is well-nigh appalling. This loss, though not accurately measured, is concededly of such volume as to call for a searching examination of its causes by all persons interested in the matter and for a speedy application of means for stopping the leaks.

The present discussion will concern itself chiefly with the second feature of the problem: *Why the church does not make an appeal to large numbers of its own children sufficiently effective to draw them into its communion.*

## I

Frank recognition of the conditions mentioned above should not obscure the more favorable fact that church

membership is growing, and at a rate of increase greater than the increase of population in America. This shows both the vitality of the church and its evangelistic zeal. Furthermore, the children of Christian families are still the church's principal resource for recruiting. But how different might be the showing did the church succeed in holding within its fellowship a more adequate proportion of its child constituency. Every one will recall readily numerous specific instances of discouraging lapses where family unity has been broken and where part of the normal spiritual seed appears to be dead. Indeed the failure to bind children of the flesh into the spiritual family is so common as not to excite much concern. Too often this is looked upon as a thing to be expected. Local congregations pursue their way in complacent disregard of the fact that their treasures are being dissipated and lambs of the flock left behind.

It is no uncommon occurrence that the son of a most devout and godly father may sustain to the church no close or vital relation whatever, his connection with it being at best merely formal and incidental. Quite often such men are friendly toward the church. They have respect, even reverence, for it as an institution, and not infrequently attend its services and support its work financially. In very many instances, too, such men are models of citizenship, upright and virtuous to a degree, foremost in civic endeavors, and leaders in everything designed to advance the public welfare. Nevertheless, the bitter truth is, they have been lost from the spiritual forces of the Kingdom of God. Their attachment to the church is sentimental. They have no strong interest in its real purpose, which is to bring sinful men to that knowledge of Christ which saves them from their sins, and, through this personal redemption, to build up a



better society. They have a certain relish for the fruit of the tree, but little concern about its root; rejoice to see the world advance ethically and favor the church as an agent of such improvement, but apparently are not affected by the soul's direct spiritual relation with God through Christ, which is the sharpest spur to true moral progress.

The children of such persons, that is, the second generation of descendants from original pious stock, are liable to reveal a somewhat different type. In them the tendency away from the church is more marked. Sentimental attachments which hold children, at least nominally, to an institution because it was the center of the parents' religious life may lose almost completely their binding power over grandchildren. The reason is apparent. The second generation lacks immediate contact with the play of deep Christian motives; they miss the contagion of Christian enthusiasm, are denied to some extent the benefits of a warm Christian home atmosphere, are without the nurture of prayer and without the stimulus and molding influences of positive Christian ideals in discussions of affairs of life within the family. One more remove from the church makes a great difference. Relation to it becomes increasingly traditional. If valued at all, it is because such connection is appraised as a sort of family heirloom, like a piece of old furniture, about as useful practically as a grandfather's clock in this day of wrist watches.

Thus it is comparatively easy to account for the waning interest of many in the second generation and, of course, of later generations that have their blood from the veins of devout forebears. What is not so easy to explain is how the church loses its grip on so large a proportion of the first generation of its children.

One would expect them to be bound securely, at least in their earlier years, to the religious institutions which enter so fully into the lives of their parents. The power of example, parental affection, direct instruction, as well as familiarity with the church and its services, are influences which should hold the hearts of children. The parents have them at the age when impressions are made most readily. Yet facts that negative such results stare one in the face and remind him that, in this field, normal expectations are not always fulfilled.

No single cause is adequate to explain this situation. Possibly all apparent and distinguishable causes together may not account for it. It may be that there are others hidden away among the strata of our life and flowing unrecognized into the streams of action, which have an important part in producing this result. However, there are some causes which can be identified and catalogued. It may be that the selection of them is more difficult than would appear at first sight, yet the task is not an impossible one.

## II

This age has a light way of accounting by surface indications for every unpleasant fact, and then dismissing it from mind. The present case is no exception. Whenever the problem with which we are now concerned is mentioned there is a disposition to refer it to a lack of parental training. The decadence of family life is made to do duty in respect to most of our ills, political and social as well as religious. The breakdown of the system of religious instruction in the family, the abandonment of the family altar, and the centering of the interest of children outside the home, are pointed to as principal factors in bringing about the state of things referred to.



Evident and deplorable as these conditions are, and distressing as must be their effects, it yet is open to doubt that the changes complained of can be held responsible, in any great degree, for the results charged against them. This problem existed when the old methods were still in use, and it was quite as acute then as now. Old-fashioned parents were no more successful in marshalling their offspring under the banner of the church than Christian parents of the modern type. Indeed, there is reason for believing that the church is gathering into its communion now a larger proportion of its children than it won a century ago. This is due in part, no doubt, to a better understanding of the child nature and a more effective approach to the child mind, both of which were either unknown or ignored until a comparatively recent date. Thus it turns out that any lowering of tone in the religious life of the family and any relaxed fidelity with respect to parental instruction are compensated by improved methods which the church itself is adopting. As judged by results in church membership, what we are losing on one hand we are gaining on the other.

As casting further doubt on the claim that the family situation accounts for all our difficulties on this score, it has been true always, as it is now, that members of the same household have chosen different paths regarding church fellowship. Indeed, this is the very heart of our problem. Children brought up under the same roof, moving in the same atmosphere, blessed by the same affection, guided by the same examples, and nourished by the same spiritual teaching, adopt widely varying courses. Nor does sex explain the difference, for boys and girls are found on both sides of the line, some following their parents into the church and some remaining

aloof. Neither can temperament be held responsible for the division, for both the way of life which leads into the church and the way which leads from it are crowded with all kinds of persons. Sometimes weaker members of a family, the ones most easily influenced, remain apart from religious activities; sometimes they are the stronger members, showing the positive traits of independence and personal initiative. The church and the world claim both types.

This is not to discount the home; no doubt the home will be found one of the prime factors in meeting the conditions under survey. It is merely designed to suggest that our outlook must be wider than that circumscribed by family life and that any solution must draw within itself other elements also.

Another tendency which is held accountable for the church's failure to retain its children in full allegiance, is best described, perhaps, by such phrases as "modern education" and "modern ways of thinking." If old-fashioned people are inclined to put the blame on the home, those who affect to be somewhat new-fashioned are quite as strongly disposed to find the chief cause of the trouble in "the scientific view" and in later methods of education generally.

It is asserted that the church's teachings are out of harmony with more recent conceptions of truth, that present day knowledge of the universe and of life, and the methods of acquiring such knowledge, carry the minds of young persons almost entirely out of the atmosphere of real religious experience and out of contact with formulae which have been held to represent the verities of religion itself. The student is left in an attitude of doubt or of complete indifference. While the student class, strictly so-called, is but a small minority



of the younger generation, yet it is contended that their thinking colors the mind of the entire group of the same age; and all the more readily, according to advocates of this view, because faculties of high schools and of preparatory schools, having had their training under the guidance of the "new learning," are bringing this influence down to the secondary institutions in which the great majority of our youth complete their education.

No one will deny the effect of the intellectual temper just described; no treatment of our problem would be in any sense complete, which did not take account of it. But pending further reference to it in another connection, it may be proper to state here the opinion, that the use of "the scientific view" to account for the church's failure to win the children of Christian families has been greatly overdone. The difficulty existed long before the "modern learning" was thought of. It is a ready explanation, of course, but this very fact exposes it to a certain suspicion.

Statistics<sup>1</sup> show that 51.3 per cent. of the members of the church, more than one-half, entered its communion before fifteen years of age, and that 64.4 per cent., almost two-thirds, became members before the age of seventeen. Of course there is a psychological reason for this fact of predominantly early association with the church. Adolescence is the period when the emotions are having marked development. It is then that Christ, the great Friend and Saviour, makes His strongest appeal, as does Christ the great Hero. But it is not the season for analysis or for the intellectual criticism and speculation which are such important elements in "modern

---

<sup>1</sup> Harold McA. Robinson, D. D., in *The Christian Educator*, October, 1923, quoting research by Dean Walter S. Athearn of Boston University School of Religious Education and Social Service.

scientific thinking." The mind has not yet reached this stage. The church receives the allegiance of the principal proportion of its members before they are affected by the mental attitudes which are said to characterize the present day. These attitudes may have influence in drawing some who earlier united with the church away from it, but they can scarcely be relied upon, to the extent some appear to believe, to furnish an answer to the question, why so many young persons who have been reared in the church never seek its fellowship at all.

1. Turning to more positive considerations, probably one cause for the loss we are trying to trace lies in *the genius of Protestantism*.

This is not to intimate that Christian churches of a different type do not have similar difficulties of their own, due to other causes; probably they do have them. Neither is it intended to suggest that Protestantism has made any fundamental mistake in its temper or has any weakened claim on later centuries. Rather it is a frank recognition of one of the perils of liberty and a reminder that we pay a price for every good—sometimes a high price.

Protestantism, if it has any distinctive character, is individualistic. It was part of a great movement extending far beyond ecclesiastical circles. Its tendency was to segregate persons from the mass of society and to disassociate the individual from institutions. It removed the agencies by which authority was mediated to the human will—at least it set these agencies at a distance. Both the church and the state as external symbols suffered by it. Men came to believe that they had a direct approach to God without religious intermediaries, and found in themselves a new seat of political



power also. The state came to be looked upon as an institution in the hand of the citizen, instead of the citizen being a victim in the grasp of the state. The state became more manifestly a means to an end, and a mere instrument to serve the purposes of the individual. He put himself under its authority voluntarily and even determined the character of that authority, both when and how it should be exercised.

A somewhat similar change affected the conception of the church, and produced corresponding results. The church's helpfulness was not denied; its necessity in order to a normal spiritual development was asserted; but God was believed to be found outside the church as well as within it, and men were taught, with increasing emphasis, to use the church for supplementing the communion which they had with the Spirit of God in other ways. Regarded no longer as the exclusive avenue of approach to the Saviour, it forfeited its ancient authority over the thinking of those affected by the new movement.

Is it not true that, as you discount the church as a visible organization and center religious life somewhat independently of it, you increase the liability to disregard its ministry in the process of Christian living? And when people are permitted to believe that they can be as good Christians apart from the church as in association with it, and while still disregarding its worship and teaching altogether, is not the door wide open to a way of life which means increasing coldness toward God Himself and indifference toward the sentiments and interests which are supposed to represent His purpose on earth? Whenever Christian living is made to turn primarily upon relation to the Saviour and upon self-commitment of the whole being to Him personally

rather than to Him as represented by a visible organization called the church, a new problem is created in securing unanimous family allegiance. This inner renewal, this vital, spiritual transaction, is immeasurably more difficult than the mere expression of it through outward association with a group of Christian people. As it is more difficult, it calls for a more intensive, continuous, varied, and effective appeal. The want of such an appeal explains some of our failures.

2. Related to this view of the subject and accentuating the difficulties we have created for ourselves by the very nature of Protestantism, is *the growing spirit of liberty*.

This spirit, in America, came to its peak toward the close of the nineteenth century. There are indications that it has been waning recently; but when the world is viewed as a whole freedom appears still to be the watchword of the latest civilization. And even in our own land it is only in certain directions, principally political, that there has been any check; in others the tide yet seems to be in its flood. The past four hundred years have been a period of emancipation; the mind has broken its fetters and every authority has a diminished significance. It is not regarded as necessary that the son shall walk in the footsteps of his father. More and more men are inclined to think for themselves, to make their own decisions; more and more they cast off the mastery of "the dead hand," break the spells of tradition, and assert their independence of all trammels whatsoever.

This state of mind has facilitated departure from family practices and neutralized the effect of parental example. A disposition to adhere to former customs and to honor the ways of forebears is now thought to

argue want of initiative and of individuality. Newness has been characteristic of life—American life in particular. The western continent was new and large, and its development required precisely the qualities which the present age provides. Its settlement has been marked by a succession of migrations, often separating families. Great distances have called for wide travel and broader contacts. In the New World almost every influence that can be named has favored the free spirit of the time and has encouraged liberty of action.

A development such as this could not fail to affect religious life. In no realm has freedom been claimed with greater insistence than in the field of religion. Because the father and mother choose to be in the church is considered no indication that the son or daughter should be there. Over-emphasized individualism of the modern age never halted at the church door. People have been sensitive about slavish imitation, particularly in respect to religion. They have made rallying cries of such words as "sincerity" and "reality," and seem to fear that adoption of what any one else has believed and confession of what any one else has felt would impeach the qualities of genuineness and candor. Nor has this spirit been limited to the latest decades when reaction from Puritan ideas has been more marked and independence of family discipline asserted by children has been especially disconcerting. It was very strong upon the population of this country in Revolutionary times and had then no little part in producing a marked decadence in church life, just as it had done on the other side of the water a little earlier and for somewhat like reasons.

3. *The nature of conversion* is another fact which throws light upon apparently dissimilar experiences



of parent and child, and accounts sometimes for the neglect by children to follow their parents into the communion of the church and to show somewhat of the same interest and enthusiasm in the church's activities.

Many who are in the church and among its most loyal and earnest members were once recruits from the world. In almost every instance these persons have had a distinctive experience of grace. This has proved to be the basis of a continuing and an increasingly enriched religious life, usually expressed in devotion to the church's worship and work. It is a thing not transmitted except through the same channel of grace. It cannot be conjured up by any magic; it does not respond to the witchery of mere sentiment; it cannot be put on your son like you might put on him a suit of clothes of the same cut as your own. There is no way by which a child may come into possession of this attitude of a parent except as the Spirit of God produces the same result in the child's heart.

Nor is there great difference when we study the careers of devoted Christians and church members who have enlisted from Christian families. Sustained service in the church, especially if it involve sacrifice, is almost a certain evidence of a saving work of God. Definite and personal relations with Christ have been set up at some point in their lives. They may have had their spiritual renewal from the mother's womb as in the case of Jeremiah and John the Baptist, or it may have come in yielding to the sweet and gentle persuasions that appeal in early childhood, or in the quieter decisions of maturer years, or in some revolutionary spiritual struggle like that of Paul. But in any event it was clear and individual and its effects recognizable.

There is such a thing as sudden interest and intense

participation in church work which may be full of promise, and yet prove to be spasmodic and short-lived. It has no surer basis than the passion for novelty or a thirst for variety in order to relieve the ennui of a busy, but possibly empty, life. Such enthusiasm burns out quickly. It soon reveals itself in its true nature and no one need long mistake it for the genuine work of God in the soul. But those who prove steadfast, whose fidelity is unwavering, whose interest never wanes, whose hearts are strong and joyful even though faith be tried and the flesh be weary, who live in the atmosphere of prayer and cling to God under all skies—these prove that their spirits have drunk deep of the unfailing wells. No one can counterfeit this; and it is too deep and vital, too distinctly personal, to be projected down the line of the generations without God's renewing operations at every step and in each individual.

It is clear that if we do not find a way to duplicate in their offspring such experiences of parents we are certain to lose from the church a considerable proportion of those whom normally it ought to enlist and use.

4. Still another cause for the church's weakness in attracting its own children is found in *intermarriages*.

Conjugal love does not always flow in the same channel as spiritual love of God. It is not an uncommon thing for the church and the world to meet in the same household. Every family of children has in it two immediate strains of blood, and often these are of quite different qualities when tried by spiritual tests. Whatever be the influence of heredity, it is just as liable to flow in one of these streams as in the other. There may be perfect harmony between the father and the mother, and even full mutual respect in regard to religion, yet blood will tell and the children are likely to show the

difference, however successfully it may have been concealed by affection and good manners on the part of the parents.

No mere deference toward religion can take the place of vital experience of it, or of practice of it as one of the habits of life. A parent in whose heart there is not the stirring of a deep devotion to God and His church may, in respect to such devotion, give every opportunity and encouragement to the other parent, yet the effect of this quasi-participation is not lost upon the children. The power of example is very strong. The father whose whole attitude toward life reveals the spirit of the world and who manifestly looks upon the church and all it represents as a thing apart from his closest and warmest interests, cannot expect his son to continue in ignorance of his true feelings or to be unaffected by those feelings. Children perceive these things much earlier than we sometimes permit ourselves to believe, and, even where the force of such example is somewhat neutralized by an outward show of allegiance to the institutions and customs of religion, hereditary tendencies that have been fixed in the temper of a child will still manifest themselves.

As the generations multiply, the number of these family traits increase in geometric proportion. Every child has four grandparents and eight great-grandparents. The effect of such influences might be presumed to diminish as they become more remote, but this is not always true. Hereditary tendencies, for a long time quiescent, sometimes leap over a number of generations and the quality of a rather distant ancestor may appear suddenly in a marked way in a member of the latest generation.

This is a delicate subject, almost too delicate to be



discussed in the pulpit or made a topic of instruction in church classes. It tends to become quite personal. It draws so close to the history of many families that the effect is not always pleasant. It is a theme about which it is easier to be silent, and yet the disadvantages of silence are most apparent. This one fact of inter-marriages between those who are devoted in their Christian life and those who have only a formal interest in it, or no interest at all, accounts for no small part of the difficulty of bringing the entire family of children into membership in the church. For even where father and mother are one in their piety and in their allegiance to the Kingdom of God, they may be the depositories of quite different hereditary influences which crop out disappointingly in their offspring.

### III

If the above diagnosis be even approximately correct, it would seem to indicate the direction in which certain remedies may be found. Of course it is easier to diagnose a disease than it is to cure it, and yet the correct identification of symptoms and the interpretation of their significance constitute the first step toward a better condition of health, probably the most important step of all. The analysis we have been attempting points clearly to certain conditions which the church should recognize if it be really serious in its purpose to become a true spiritual mother to the children born into its fellowship.

1. Clearly there is need of *a quickened sense of family solidarity*.

The unity of the household is almost a lost conception. Undoubtedly this loss has had compensating advantages, and it would be folly to try to turn back the

current of progress. It would be a misfortune if the freedom which has inspired the individual to be himself and to make his fullest personal contribution to society should be destroyed; but liberty which causes children to neglect the family as a social and spiritual entity is a liberty that is running wild. It cannot be denied that consciousness of family responsibility has weakened. There are many indications of this, such as the achievement of full political rights by women and the growing independence of young children. These are not causes, but symptoms. Perhaps they are symptoms of social health if properly viewed and rightly used, but they show the danger which besets the idea of the family and how necessary it is that a growing individualism be balanced by a deepened realization of group relationships and duties.

This is a burden which falls upon the church because the motives and impulses which sustain the family are primarily religious. The church must learn soon a lesson which it has been neglecting of late years, namely, that certain old truths require re-assertion and fresh emphasis. Somehow we have acquired the feeling that it is not proper to press an idea which was to the fore a century ago; but the fact is that many of the newer views of life and the changing customs of society render a re-study of old principles imperative.

All of this is especially pertinent with respect to the family. It would be almost tragic if the enlarging interest and activity of the individual should decentralize his life from the home. The newer views on this subject call insistently for a restatement of the older ones. The newer practices require a balancing stress upon former customs. It is only half true that "Time makes ancient good uncouth." There are instances in

which time makes ancient good doubly beautiful and authoritative. The home as the primary social unit must win from both mind and conscience even a higher allegiance if the state as the secondary social unit is to survive. The day of altered opinions looks both forward and backward—forward for the impulse to advance and improve, backward for steadying principles defined by experience and for contacts with the ever-living past which have always determined the course of true and constructive progress.

The church must raise the old banner of family unity and carry it at the head of the advancing hosts. It must define again the spiritual principles which lie at the basis of this conception. It must give these principles a distinct place in the substance of its teaching and press them upon the moral sense of the new generation. Children must be made to feel the necessity for the family existing as a whole and acting as a whole. They must feel that the community is judging the family as a whole. Family name and family traditions and family pride are shibboleths which we cannot afford to ignore, especially when such possessions have a religious quality. If instruction like this is imbedded in the thinking of the heads of a household and becomes the atmosphere in which children are brought up, it will prove the centripetal force to hold the family together and will overcome the centrifugal influences which tend to throw the members apart, each on his own tangent. What this would mean as a background and motive for greater unity of action with respect to the church requires only to be suggested.

2. There is corresponding need for a *truer conception of the nature and office of the church.*

An over-emphasis upon the church's relation to



religious life and upon its authority and the stressing of a sanctity which had reference to external ritual opened the way for a reaction which later centuries have carried to a dangerous extreme. In religion there is a place for individual opinion and effort much as there is in politics, but in both these fields there is also a place, and a large one, for consensus of view and for corporate activity. This corporate relationship has suffered greatly in modern thinking, due to the overwrought spirit of individualism. No man can live his religious life unto himself. Any attempt to have our spiritual experiences wholly apart from our fellow-men will result in stunted growth and uneven development. There is a psychology of these later decades which teaches us that worship must be a social action and that a lonely soul in the presence of God serves only a small part of human needs.

But beyond this, the church is a necessary agency for service. It responds to the modern impulse toward organization. It enables the individual to do some things which alone he could not accomplish at all, and to do some other things with greatly increased effectiveness. As an organized impulse, sentiment, and practice, the church is in the modern trend. This is an immense advantage of which it is not making full use. It has an appeal which can scarcely be refuted by those who have adopted the thinking of the present generation. This is an era of "joiners" who in a broad way are seeking the general good, and it is difficult to see how, logically, any one so minded can ignore the church, especially when it offers the associations which conserve and develop one of the primary and most powerful interests of life.

This may seem like removing discussion of the

church and its office from the sacred field in which that discussion has been presumed to move. But not so. It only enlarges the argument. It points to an approach to the modern mind which the church is well nigh neglecting. Every proper means must be employed to re-establish the church as a divinely chosen witness to the Kingdom of God and the divinely appointed institution for bringing that Kingdom to complete authority and control over life. When children coming to consciousness of their environment and responsibility, conceive of the church as an agency which cannot be disregarded in the full development of their own spiritual life and in the full service they are to render to their fellow-men, the church will find an easier task in winning the association and support of these who ought to become its foremost sponsors.

This opportunity the church has in its own hands. It should believe in itself. It should assert without stammering its spiritual superiority and its moral primacy. It should cease to permit itself to be made the butt of jests and a door-mat upon which every well-meaning advocate of a "cause" may wipe his shoes preparatory to entrance into the good graces of the public. It needs to realize that it speaks for God, and then be careful that it utter no word except His. It needs to impress men with its prophetic function and, accordingly, to deserve and insist upon their regard. We shall not succeed in inducing children who are born in the church to adhere to it if the church never defines, or declares but feebly, its place in their lives but permits them to come to maturity with the idea that relation to it is entirely optional, it being possible to disregard it without damage to themselves and without social or spiritual offense.

3. With a sounder view about them, there must be *better co-operation between home and church.*

Once religious training of children was reserved almost wholly for the home, although the church exercised a certain pastoral supervision. That day has gone, and perhaps we need waste no vain regrets over its passing. It may be that the occasion for the change is to be deplored. In many instances this occasion has been sheer neglect; parents have permitted the flock to range untended. The church had no desire to usurp the office of the home, but increasingly it has assumed these duties of religious instruction simply because the children were unfed spiritually.

In some respects the church is much better equipped than the home for imparting religious teaching. The change does not represent a complete loss; it may turn to real advantage if the home will do its part. It never was possible for either of these institutions to discharge this responsibility with best results, alone. There is great gain in the modern movement which places a principal share of this work in the hands of the church, because the church can readily command the resources which will enable it to give instruction systematically and scientifically and according to principles acknowledged to be correct. It can take time to teach the children continuously and consistently and can furnish a teaching force qualified to render this service in the best way.

But church teaching will be well-nigh fruitless if it does not find a supporting atmosphere in the home. The seed can germinate only in the soil of family sympathy with the work the church is undertaking to perform. The child must be made to feel that the home and the church are one in their purpose to give him the best that



each possesses, and that the two are making a single effort to provide him with proper spiritual nurture and discipline. Educators have learned long since that public school work is almost fatally handicapped without the intelligent co-operation of the home. Schools have their parents' associations to create proper understanding and sympathy between teachers in the school and teachers in the home. If this be necessary in secular education, it is doubly imperative when children are to be taught the truths and experiences which pertain to their relations with God and eternity and their social responsibilities among the children of God. 'This growing movement among the churches, for furnishing suitable religious instruction and practice for the children of their families, faces no more discouraging and hampering interferences than the indifference of parents. Fathers and mothers themselves must first be educated in this regard before satisfactory results may be expected, and public opinion must be brought to the point of allowing the church time and opportunity to render this service.

4. If conditions are to improve it would seem there must be *a new realization that religion is a comprehensive and controlling factor in life.*

It is not a department, much less a compartment. It is not a phase of life. It covers all phases and gives color and quality to each of them. The opposite view has been an age-long heresy. Notwithstanding the plain teaching of Jesus to the contrary men have stubbornly insisted on treating religion as something apart from ordinary affairs. The dangers attending this attitude are now doubly increased by life's growing complexity. We are not living in the simple way our fathers lived. Life is presenting, especially to young people, so many

new interests and activities, it creates such multiplied contacts, and entices by the promise of so many new kinds of success, that character requires to be mightily buttressed. The entire moral organization threatens to break down if there is not cast into the whole of it the restraining and the inspiring influences of religion. Both of these are needed. Restraint alone will not suffice. The positive aspects of character must feel the urge of newer and higher impulses, and the great opportunities now before us, bewildering in their number, require in each person an augmented spiritual stimulus. Vital religion is the only element which will meet these conditions, and we must get it into the minds of the children. Religion must be shown to them as an arching sky over the whole of their lives. Every activity must make a religious appeal; every duty must be undertaken in the religious spirit.

This will open the way for correction of some mistakes referred to above. For instance, it will aid in a new interpretation of freedom. Liberty will be conditioned by service; it will be seen to exist in order that men may be more helpful. The perils of liberty are in a self-centered life. Its bad effects come from our using it selfishly. The unrestrained freedom of the present generation will become an element of good if mastered by the religious motive. Progress lies in the direction of guiding this tendency, not in fighting it—and the guiding principle is in our hands if we are only wise enough and faithful enough to employ it. Religion and more religion are the security against the menace arising from the determination of mankind to be unshackled.

A right view of religion as covering the whole of life will assist in solving the problem of intermarriages. It

would prevent any light concern about matrimonial unions as mere matters of private taste and social arrangement. If a generation of young people could be made to feel that religion enters vitally into everything they do, especially into their choices and relationships, they would be swift to interpret marriage in this light and would shrink from taking the step in any other spirit. So with every duty. Life requires to be thoroughly hallowed in the thinking of the church. Nothing is common in the sense of being unsanctified. God hath cleansed all. If ever the church is to win a larger proportion of its children, it must believe as part of its own living faith for every day use that commitment to Christ on the part of those who confess Him is all-inclusive, and then must teach this faith diligently to the generation following.

5. In order to reap the full harvest of its children, the church must offer them *an education in Christianity* which corresponds to modern pedagogical principles and methods.

To teach secular subjects in one way and religion in another is well-nigh fatal to results. The study of child life and the science of education generally have been carried to a high degree of perfection. No doubt there is much yet to be discovered in these fields, and perhaps we are making mistakes now which must be corrected later. This is the penalty of all progress. Yet the general principles of instruction have been definitely and correctly ascertained. They are having application in all our schools. The moment a child enters the kindergarten these influences begin to play upon him. The child adjusts himself to certain ways of learning. Appeals to his mind and even to his heart are made by means and methods to which he responds readily and



happily. To utilize new methods in the day school and cling to the old methods in the church school is to carry the child every Sunday into a strange country.

The idea that religion cannot be presented as other subjects are taught is not sound. There are phases of religion that are unique, but these can be got over to the child's moral nature by the same methods which are employed to convey truth of any other kind. Too long we have been instructing children in religion for future use. It is time we awakened to the fact that there is a religious life which is just as normal to childhood as one that is normal to adult age. All the means which the schools use in order to develop the child for his present advantage must be claimed by the church to enrich the religious experience of its children long before they come to manhood and womanhood. Nothing will go further toward convincing them that religion is an important, and indeed a mastering, phase of their lives than an instruction in this subject which they feel corresponds in method and spirit to the teaching they are receiving every day in the schools.

6. One additional measure which the church must adopt is the laying of *a new stress on conversion*, as was forecast in another paragraph.

The church is maintaining its membership and increasing it slowly by enlistments from sources outside itself. It fills its depleted ranks by fresh levies from those not brought up under its care. The boast about its growing numbers would die on the church's lips if it were frank enough to analyze conditions and identify sources of supply. To be sure, it is the glory of the church that it is able to win adherents from the world and make them confessors of Christ. The church exists for this very purpose; but its shame is written large

when it faces the truth that its gains from this quarter are almost balanced by losses from the children that have been nourished on its bosom.

This new strength won from the world brings to the church fresh vitality and an added spirit of devotion. It enters by the gateway of conversion. The new life of Christ in the soul is appreciated by the subject of it. In his worldly environments he has not been accustomed to it. It blesses his soul with the flavor of something Heavenly, and all the new-found ardor which it produces he brings into the church with him to revive the church's languid interest and to speed the pace of its halting activities.

The evangelistic appeal, by whatever method, is the thing which has saved the church's membership from decimation. This kind of appeal, by means that are suitable of course, must be carried to the children of Christian families also. *Evangelistic methods*, so-called, have caused us to become wary of *evangelization*. The very terms are embarrassing. We need to realize that Christ asks for the child's life and insists with loving entreaty that every power and opportunity, every interest and affection, be offered to Him that He may cleanse it and strengthen it, and then direct the use of it for the blessing of him who brings it and of all the world besides. There are many ways of attaining this result—ways that are adapted to the tenderest years of childhood, ways suited to the temper of boys and girls who are just coming to self-consciousness and an appreciation of all that life holds for them.

We must put behind us the idea that religious instruction consists only in memorizing texts and familiarizing the child's mind with the facts of Bible history. These are means to an end. The end is a surrender of

the self to Christ. This surrender can be made in childhood. It may become the normal attitude, a fixed habit of mind. Analysis of this spiritual transaction and of the elements which enter into it may be deferred until adult years. Doubtless there are thousands who never have any intelligent understanding of the means by which it is brought about. But it is a fact of experience, like so many other acts of the will that are never analyzed. Such definite adjustment to Christ is the true goal of all Christian teaching. Until this is won its victory is incomplete. Being born into the church is a high privilege and much to be prized, but even those so favored have no exemption from this specific claim of Christ, that every soul submit in love and obedience to Him. "We have Abraham to our father" was a plea which John the Baptist would not admit as voiding necessity of repentance; and the inheritance of young life through Christian families and nurture in the church only advances stronger reasons and deeper motives for performing the primary duty and claiming the divine privilege of embracing Christ.

Until some of the measures indicated have been adopted, or all of them put to fuller use, we shall still hear "Rachel weeping for her children."



# THE HASMONAEANS AND HEROD THE IDUMAEAN

By E. G. SIHLER, Professor Emeritus, New York University

THE names indeed and deeds of these, from the era of Antiochus Epiphanes to the latter years of Augustus Caesar, are closely intertwined with the Post-exilian history of Hierosolyma and so also with the *incunabula* of the church of Jesus Christ. There is no space here even for a bald chronicle,<sup>1</sup> which would weary writer and readers alike. For "philosophy of history," so-called, I have but a slender regard, particularly that of Hegel and his recent disciple, Croce. I hold what I have said in former works, that the great aim and duty of history (and historiography) is to ascertain what really happened, to gain a closer vision of decisive personalities, motives, ethnical character or bent, economic and geographical circumstances. As in my last work,<sup>2</sup> I shall inject no thesis or academic prejudice into my present or subsequent themes; I leave such to the itch of original geniuses who recast and rewrite the history of the world from time to time. I stand here with tried and true historians, such as Polybius and Leopold von Ranke.

It is sometimes said that, as Palestine was the domicile of the Jewish race, so the same *Coele Syria* furnished the cradle of Christendom; or, as some put it,

---

<sup>1</sup> A synchronistic syllabus, still extremely useful, may be found at the end of the excellent New Testament History by Dr. William Smith, London, 1866 and since.

<sup>2</sup> From Augustus to Augustine, Cambr. Univ. Press, 1923, first published in this quarterly in twelve monographs, 1916-1922.

Judaism was the *matrix* of Christianity. I will not waste ink in contentious writing, nor try to dazzle or titillate my readers with an occasional epigram, not being a Seneca, Tacitus or Lessing. To Post-exilian Judaea her Persian sovereigns were kindly disposed; they could not be unfriendly to the purer monotheism of the expatriated Jews on the Euphrates where these had sat down and wept when they remembered Zion (Ps. 137). These, after all, were the *élite* of Judah (and Benjamin); the common peasants had been left behind. It is impressively clear that Isaiah and Jeremiah now had a prestige with these remnants which they had not had in their own day by their spiritual-political testimony, so curiously fused and interdependent in that theocratic state. The rebuilding of the temple,<sup>3</sup> the scrupulously rigorous restoration of the elaborate daily ritual, was the *summum bonum* for the returning exiles under Nehemiah, Zerubbabel, and, particularly, under Ezra. The descendants of Asaph (Ezra 1:15), *e. g.*, aimed at the strict re-enactment of the sacred musical service. The sacred vessels were delivered in accordance with the precise inventory held by the Persian treasurer (Ezra 1:8-11).

The most important matter for the returning exiles (being of the second and third generation, too) was genealogical verification of their status, particularly for those who aspired to re-enter their ancestral places as singers, Levites, priests, doorkeepers. Many failed of restoration; "these sought their register among those that were reckoned by genealogy, but they were not found; therefore were they, as polluted, put from the priesthood" (Ezra 2:62); only 42,360 were regis-

---

<sup>3</sup> As for the jealousy and hatred of Samaria, or mongrel Israelites, see Josephus; *Archaeologia* xi, 4:3. I shall use the abbreviation *Antiqq.* (*Antiquitates*) in the present study.

tered in the first returning, with 7,330 of the servant class.

Politically they remained subjects of Susa and Persepolis. It is true the satraps of Syria and Phoenicia were ordered to pay a definite royal allowance for the continuity and orderly maintenance of the sacrifices (ἐνδελεχῶς),<sup>4</sup> which were rigorously prescribed as the essential concomitants of prayer; an allowance for the steers, rams, lambs, wheat, salt, oil, and wine, day by day, without fail, in order that (I translate from the LXX, I Ezra 6: 30) "there shall be offered up libations to the *Highest God* in behalf of the King [of Persia] and his children, and that they shall pray for the lives of the same." The most incisive power which Ezra got from Artaxerxes (about 450 B. C.) was control, ecclesiastic supervision, over all professed Jews, with power to penalize recalcitrants even up to and inclusive of capital punishment (Ezra 7: 24-25). Ezra was officially certified by the Persian government as the "priest and reader of the Law of the Highest God." The segregation of half-Jews, this ethnical purism, was closely bound up with that of the worship. (Cf. Neh. 13.)

Alexander's generals after his death at Babylon, 323 B. C., in time partitioned his new empire in many wars and incessant feuds. Imperialism, that *ignis fatuus* of greed and ambition, passes before the student of history in kaleidoscopic and incalculable changes. These wars of the "Diadochi" were like the rushing and restless tides of smaller oceans fusing or counter-fusing. In this period Greek—Hellenistic Greek—became the ruling speech of international affairs, of politics, trade, and professional pursuits. Kiepert's charts, in his *Atlas*

<sup>4</sup> Cf. also the term ἐνδελεχισμός in Josephus: *Antiqq.* xi, 4:1: Καὶ προσφορὰς μετὰ ταῦτα καὶ τοὺς καλουμένους ἐνδελεχισμούς.



*Antiquus*, tell the tale of this world conquest of the Greek tongue, and of new capitals with Greek names. Thus in Egypt, Alexandria (where the Macedonian conqueror was entombed), Hermopolis, Heliopolis, Arsinoe, Oxyrynchos, Ptolemais—the hundred-gated Thebes renamed *Diospolis Magna*. The Macedonian dynasty of the Seleucidæ in 312 assumed the proud title of Kings of Asia. Between these and the *Lagidae* of the Nile empire, Palestine, or *Coele Syria*, almost from the first was the apple of discord. Of the Seleucid empire then we notice: Seleucia, on the Euphrates, another on the Syrian coast; Apameia, on the Orontes (named for a queen), one in Babylonia (the Kut-el-Amara of the World War), another in Bithynia; Antioch on the Orontes (ἐπὶ Δάφνης), another in Caria, one in Phrygia, one on the Maeander; Laodicea (for a Queen Laodike) in Syria, in Lycaonia, in *Coele Syria*, in Phrygia. (Cf. Apocalypse 3: 14; Strabo 629-630, ed. Casaubon). And, finally, in Palestine, not so far from Mt. Zion and the Temple of Nehemiah, we find Pella, named from the old capital of Macedon, and Scythopolis; new and older names had currency, as, *e. g.*, Lydda-Diospolis, Emmaus-Nicopolis. Then, too, the older topical and geographical names had to be adjusted to the practical necessities of Greek speech and Greek inflection. Josephus fairly teems with such.<sup>5</sup> Most of Trans-jordania was called Peraea, and the New Testament frequently quotes the name of the Decapolis. Here then we have a veritable ocean of Hellenistic life, speech, manners, the Olympian tradition yielding more and more to king-cult, where little Judah was an isle,

---

<sup>5</sup>I here refer with warmest gratitude to *Topographisch-Historisches Lexicon zu den Schriften des Flavius Josephus*, by Gustav Boettger, Leipzig, 1879.

whose aloofness was a veritable challenge to the envying nations, or *ἔθνη*.

From 312-168 B. C., whether under sway of Egypt or of "Asia," Jerusalem was fairly autonomous as far as the worship was concerned. Taxes indeed were heavy enough. The hierarchy, descended from Aaron, with its apex in the High Priest, does not seem to have had any secular ambition. Mommsen<sup>6</sup> compared it all with the position of the Pope surrounded by secular governments and still with a central power of widest periphery radiating in every direction. The ever expanding *Diaspora* of the Jews, now a commercial, no longer an agricultural, race, furnished heavy and steadily increasing revenue to the central sanctuary at Jerusalem.

But into this orderly, and in a way prosperous, system came like a mad tornado the person and policy of Antiochus IV, *Epiphanes* (176-164 B. C.). The extinction of the great sister kingdom of Macedon, at Pydna 168 B. C., the humiliation by the same Romans of his father Antiochus the Great in 190-188 B. C., with limitation of empire and with crushing indemnities, did not give him pause. The insane and incredible ostentation of the games and shows in his capital, not so long after Aemilius Paulus had put an end to Macedon, scenes set forth in detail by the contemporary Polybius, afford to us some key to his character.<sup>7</sup> He had invaded Egypt, whose king, Ptolemy Philometor, was but a child; the treasure he wasted in that crazy display at Antioch came largely from his loot of Egyptian

<sup>6</sup> *Die Provinzen (des Römischen Reichs)*, ch. xI, *Judaea und die Juden*. Here too we must name the admirable work by Ign. Doellinger (no more antiquated even now, than Gibbon) *Heidenthum und Judenthum*, Regensburg, 1857.

<sup>7</sup> Polybius xxxI, 3. His invasion of Egypt had been treacherous; Polybius closes with the significant words: "He was a *sacrilegus*."

shrines. His contemporaries called him instead of Epiphanes, *Epimanes*, the Madman.

His father, Antiochus the "Great," in the earlier part of his reign had wrested the greater part of Palestine or *Coele Syria* from Egypt; attempting invasion of Egypt he had suffered a crushing defeat at Raphia (Polybius v, 79-87; he describes the battle with that tactical clearness of which he was master); the Macedonian phalanx figured heavily on both sides, also African and Indian elephants. What was little Judaea amid the mighty conflicts of these empires? But later, in 198 B. C., Antiochus the "Great" defeated the Egyptian<sup>8</sup> boy-king's chief-commander, Scopas, at the Panium on the upper Jordan, 198 B. C., and regained all of Palestine. Jerusalem welcomed the "King of Asia" gladly, for her people had suffered much from Scopas who, as Polybius puts it, had "subjugated the people of the Jews." Polybius, by the bye, curiously but quite justly identifies capital and sanctuary—"those of the Jews who dwell about the Sanctuary called 'Hierosolyma.'" Now Antiochus was grateful for their welcome and material aid. Josephus (*Antiqq.* xii, 3:3) presents a letter which Antiochus Magnus wrote at the time, from which I now beg to transcribe:

"All belonging to the race [*πάντες οἱ ἐκ τοῦ ἔθνους*] shall carry on their own government [*πολιτεῦσθωσαν*] in accordance with their ancestral laws; their body of elders [*γερονσία*] and the priests and the scribes [*γραμματεῖς*] of the Sanctuary, and the Psalm-chanters shall be relieved from the poll-tax, and from the golden wreath and from

---

<sup>8</sup> This was Ptolemy V, Epiphanes, only eleven years old at the time. It was his coronation decree, of 204 B. C., which is inscribed on what is now known as the Rosetta Stone, "which," as William Smith noted, "afforded the foundation for the art of deciphering Egyptian hieroglyphics," as practiced by Champollion and Lepsius.



the rest. And in order that the city may be more speedily settled with residents [κατοικισθῆ] I grant to those dwelling in it and to those who are going to come in by the month Hyperberetaios \* that they shall be free from taxation for three years."

For the future they were to pay but two-thirds of the annual tribute hitherto paid. All captured and enslaved Jews were to be restored to liberty. All Mosaic laws and all dietary statutes, also the stern regulations as to entrance or non-entrance into the temple, were published as guaranteed by royal sanctions. But there was a Greek, or Hellenizing, party at the Jewish capital; these in Maccabees I and II are called the "law-abandoning" Jews (ἄνομοι), the renegades.

One of these, Joshua, adjusted his name to Greek ears, as Jason; Onias III was assassinated at Antioch, while the beneficiary of that crime, his brother "Jason," bought the High Priest's place for money. But the King took the honor from him and gave it to his next brother, another Onias, who had assumed the classic name of Menelaus (Josephus XII, 5, 1) and who paid heavily for the preferment at Antioch. (172 B. C.) This high priest actually erected a gymnasium, or *palaestra*, at Jerusalem, where up-to-date youth in Hellenic garb, or non-garb, pursued athletic games. It was a furious feud, a purely secular struggle for pelf and power, on the part of this classical pair, that caused or facilitated the direct and personal intervention, on Mt. Zion, of Antiochus Epiphanes. After his two invasions of the Nile kingdom, he was (in 168 B. C.) forbidden to attempt a third campaign, forbidden by the Roman envoy, the Senator Popilius Laenas, in a unique and per-

---

\* The last month of the Macedonian year, September-October, the Hebrew *Tishri*.

empty fashion. The King's first visit to Jerusalem had occurred in 169 B. C.; the Hellenizing faction opened the gates; many of the orthodox and patriotic leaders were put to death; and Epiphanes, after looting much temple treasure, such as the golden altar and the candlabrum of seven arms, departed for his capital.

We must say at this point what has often been observed before. Josephus, while reading also his Polybius with care, follows in the main the First of Maccabees. This accurate historical chronicle, in its simplicity of narrative modeled on the book of Kings, or Judges, maintains a consistent attention to time and place. Josephus takes this over, without much stylistic padding, but he clarifies the *catena rerum gestarum*, and furnishes not a little of what we may call elucidation of motive and an analysis of the psychological points of given character. We are in this grave epoch of Jewish history by no means dealing with *sagas* of legendary heroes, although the times of the priest Matthatias of Modin and his sons constituted truly a heroic age, a term much abused, even by some historians.

Now Epiphanes (or Epimanes) in the steadily advancing shadow of Roman imperialism had conceived for his own polyglot and ethnically composite empire a positive uniformity and ethnical consolidation;<sup>10</sup> all were to be, in a word, Greeks. At Jerusalem then, too, the apostates and renegades were many. Antiochus was fanatically consistent; he simply forbade the further practice of the worship prescribed by Moses and Ezra, even circumcision, on pain of death. Spies and inspectors [ἐπίσκοποι] were ubiquitous. Loyal Israelites had to flee into deserts or mountain solitudes. One thinks of Louis XIV and the Camisards in the Cevennes. The books of the Law, wherever found, were destroyed, and the possessors executed by royal decree. The colonnades around the temple became brothels (II Macc.,

<sup>10</sup> I Macc. 1:41, 42: Καὶ ἔγραψεν ὁ βασιλεὺς πάσῃ τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ, εἶναι [that all *should* be] πάντας λαὸν ἕνα, καὶ ἐγκαταλείπειν ἕκαστον τὰ νόμιμα αὐτοῦ.

6:4). This then was the "abomination of desolation" (βδέλυγμα ἐρημώσεως)<sup>11</sup> (Dan. 9:27; 12:11).

On the easy and idiomatic Greek of II Maccabees, I must not here dwell; composed out of an original of five books, as of about 124 B. C., breathing the latitude of Alexandria and the Alexandrine Diaspora, perhaps, and furnishing a mass of vivid and often dramatic detail, often illuminating, and possibly conceived to illumine, I Maccabees. The author perhaps was a *γραμματεὺς* of the *Diaspora*, a man too of Hellenic culture. We note particularly these words (II Macc. 5:9): "*Not on account of the place did the Lord choose the people, but the place on account of the people.*"

Then was substituted pagan cult in the Holiest, and Greek altars were set up in all the towns of Judah. It was in the 145th year of the Macedonian era of the Seleucidae, 167 B. C. Women who had circumcised their male babes were slain, their infants hanged around their mothers' necks (I Macc. 1:62). Many preferred death to forbidden diet.

We must now quite concisely give an outline of the events beginning in the little mountain town of Modin, northwest of Jerusalem. When the aged Aaronite Matthias died, in 167 B. C., that genius of achievement amid slender resources, Judas Maccabaeus (the Hammer) came forward, he for the field, his brother Simon for counsel. The battle of Beth Horon was a glorious victory. Meanwhile the difficulties of his treasury lured Epiphanes to make an expedition to the East, to loot fanes never looted before and to make the newly risen dynasty of the Parthian Arsacidae in Susiana tributary. He failed in both, and died in the Euphrates country 164 B. C., whereas, in 165 B. C. the scrolls of the

---

<sup>11</sup> Cited by Jesus the Christ Himself in that awful indictment and prophecy (Matt. 24:15; cf. 23:37)—*dies irae*, the stern majesty of which will ever echo through the ages—where again we meet the phrasing of the LXX.



Torah were unrolled once more, brought forth out of their concealment from the "Greeks," or "Nations." In 164 at last, Judas Maccabaeus, after a great victory at Beth Sura, south of Jerusalem, was at last able to re-enter the Holy City; worship was actually begun, *Chisleu* month, 25th day; the anniversary always celebrated thereafter as the Feast of the Dedication (τὰ ἐγκαίνια) in winter; grass had grown in the courts of the temple, the priests' cells (παιστοφόρια) had fallen in.

In 162 B. C. Demetrius, the oldest grandson of Antiochus the Great, made good his escape from Italy where he was a kind of hostage, though socially entirely free.

It was all described, with every detail, by Polybius (xxxr, 12 sqq.) who had a hand in the scheme. Josephus used Polybius, and, at the conclusion of that great historian, Josephus used Strabo's great historical continuation, now lost, which the general reader must not confound with the work of Strabo's old age, his *Geographica*, of the time of Tiberius.

Demetrius succeeded in seizing the diadem of his fathers, putting to death his hapless young cousin; thus in the dynastic feud of the "Macedonians" of Antioch began a new era for Judas and his brethren. These upheavals at the fountain head of Judah's oppressors never really ended. The successive rivals or pretenders were compelled by circumstances to grant much consideration to Judas and his successors. It is true, under the king just named (Demetrius I, Soter) the renegade Jews led by the High Priest Alkimos had a brief period of triumph. Judas was to be got rid of on any terms. But he with true political vision sought the protection of Rome; her *Senatus consulta* began more and more to determine the course of events in Palestine, much more so than the Macedonian phalanx or elephants or mercenary forces from Cilicia, Cyprus or Crete. The Sen-

ate, appealed to by Eupolemos and Jason, the envoys from Judaea, warned Soter to respect the autonomy of Judaea.

The *Senatus consultum* then enacted was bilingual, Roman and Greek; it recognized Judas as High Priest. It is true Demetrius Soter defied the Great Council, and in 160 B. C. Alkimos the renegade once more occupied the seat of Aaron. Judas perished in the field and was buried near his father at Modin in the mountains. In 159 B. C. Alkimos the creature of Antioch actually began to demolish the inner temple, "the work of the prophets" (Haggai and Zechariah), when he suffered a stroke and died soon after. In 157 Bacchides concluded a formal peace with Jonathan and Simon. In 152 B. C. a new pretender arose, Alexander Balas. Both he and the actual King of "Asia" now sued for the support of Judaea. Besides regaining all the fortified places and the capital too, Jonathan now at last got hold of "David's City," the castle or "acropolis" (as Josephus in one passage calls it) of Jerusalem. Josephus bluntly says that Alexander Balas *made* Jonathan High Priest. Soter (I Macc. 10:25-45) bid heavily against Balas.

And at last we learn with precision what was, or had been, the economic condition of Judaea. The taxes for Antioch had been as follows: One-third of the harvests, one-half of all timber cut, a "tribute" (probably a financial impost levied at large), a salt tax, a poll tax. Note carefully this offer: All the Jews in the Syrian Empire (in "Asia") were to have freedom of worship and the keeping of their own holidays (*loc. cit.*, v. 34). Three further districts to be added to the sphere of administration wielded by the High Priest. The revenue from Ptolemais and its district to go toward the upkeep

of the worship of the temple. The 15,000 shekels of silver, hitherto collected annually from the funds of the temple, were now to be discontinued.

But Jonathan distrusted these offers and came to the side of Balas. In 150 B. C. Jonathan was formally and brilliantly recognized as legal head of Judaea by Ptolemy Philometor and the latter's son-in-law, Alexander Balas. Balas created Jonathan *μεριδάρχης*, that is, a "provincial governor"—no real autonomy as yet.

In 147 the pretenders' wars flared up once more, Demetrius II landed with mercenaries from Crete and gained the diadem at Antioch in the next year. Jonathan paid heavily for recognition, and offered 300 talents for remission of taxes to be collected from Judaea. The terms settled were fair enough for Judaea, but a new pretender came forward; "Tryphon" (Diodotos of Apameia) set up a son of Balas as Antiochus VI. Jonathan sent an embassy to Rome. The Senate at least gave the envoys a document for safe passage back to Palestine. Tryphon later on, under pretence of a conference at Ptolemais, treacherously arrested Jonathan and after carrying him about as a prisoner had him put to death, 143 B. C. But Simon, the last of the sons of Matthatias, assumed control with the hearty approval of Jerusalem.

From this point on, as Josephus puts it, the political importance of the Pharisees began to loom. He refers in *Antiquitates* XIII, 5:9 to the fuller presentation he had made, in *Bellum Judaicum* II, 8:1-14, of Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes, the last receiving the lion's share in that important description. The parallels there suggested by Josephus, of Jehovah, *c. g.*, with the "Fate" (*εἰμαρμένη*) of the Stoics, we cannot well take seriously.

In 142 B. C. Tryphon formally recognized the independence of Judaea. Perhaps there was a hint from



Rome, for the preceding year Scipio Aemilianus, the most eminent Roman of that day, had been sent on a general political mission to Alexandria and the East. (Polybius xxxiv, 14:6.) In 142 B. C., then, "the yoke of the nations [ὁ ζυγος τῶν ἐθνῶν] was taken from Israel" (I Macc. 13:41), and the latter once more began to write her own annals. The pagan garrison on Mt. Zion was starved into capitulation. Peace once more, each "dwelling under his own vine and fig tree." Numenios was sent to the Senate in Rome, not empty-handed, however. He presented as a gift from the High Priest Simon, a golden shield worth 1,000 *minae*, to gain an alliance with Rome. The Great Council formally renewed the old treaties, and recognized Simon as High Priest, commander of the forces, and "Ethnarch of the Jews and of the Priests" (I Macc. 14:47), while Antiochus VII recognized the Jewish right of coinage, cancelling also all financial claims of Antioch.

In 138 B. C. Numenios returned from Rome with a new treaty. Ptolemy Physcon is warned therein to return to Simon's jurisdiction all Jewish rebels seeking shelter in Egypt. The same warning is addressed to all Western Asia, to Attalus of Pergamum, to the King of Cappadocia (even to Arsaces of Parthia), and to very many of the minor states or communities in the Greek world, such as Sparta, Delos, Myndos, Sikyon, Samos, Pamphylia, Lycia, Halicarnassus, Phaselis (a town of Lycia), the island of Cos, Side (coast of Pamphylia), Arados (a coast town of Phenicia), Gortyn (Crete), Knidos, Cyprus, Cyrene (I Macc. 15:22-23).

What does it all mean? The solution, to me, seems to be this: It is the *Diaspora* of the Jews; these, on petition from Jerusalem, and under Roman protection, are, everywhere, to live in peace and follow their religious

worship without let or hindrance. All this meant much for the prestige and revenue of the High Priest and temple. Judaism then, even so early, had secured the favored position of a *religio licita*, a franchise which the Christians later on did not gain before the Milan decree of Constantine, 313 A. D.

Old Simon successfully defied Antiochus Sidetes, and even gained a victory through his sons Judas and John, but fell a victim, in 135, to a foul conspiracy of his own son-in-law, Ptolemaios, at a banquet at Jericho. The wretched plotter had planned to become Satrap of Antioch. But the Hasmonaeans now entered upon an era of freedom, not hindered from either Alexandria or Antioch. Simon's son, the able and adroit John Hyrcanus I, ruled as High Priest from 135 to 106 B. C. and died in his bed. But his Hellenism in the administration of the Mosaic cult gave keen displeasure to the Pharisees, the ultra-conservatives in that theocratic state, and they had reason. Hyrcanus opened the mausoleum of King David and rifled it of 3,000 talents of silver; also he was the first ruler to establish a force of mercenaries, nucleus of a standing army (*Antiqq.* XIII, 8:4). Having no further allegiance to the wretched Seleucidae, he threw in his lot at home with the Sadducees, largely recruited from the wealthy (*ob. cit.* XIII, 8:10).

Hyrcanus was followed in 106 B. C. by his oldest son, Aristobulus I, who was the first High Priest to assume the royal diadem and the name, 481 years after the beginning of the Babylonian exile. His queen, Alexandra, inspired him with fear and distrust of his martial brother Antigonus, and he became, somewhat unwittingly, a fratricide (*op. cit.* XIII, 11:1). He died the next year, 105 B. C., being succeeded by his brother

Alexander Jannaeus. The war of this Hasmonaean king with Ptolemy Lathuros left him free in the end to expand his little empire on the coast and southward, where he leveled Gaza to the ground. He became an object of loathing and hatred to the old believers, and began an internecine war against them. In six years, if Josephus is to be believed, Jannaeus caused the death of some 50,000 Jews; beginning with the massacre, through his mercenaries, of 6,000 Jews at the Feast of Tabernacles (*op. cit.* XIII, 13:5). Once, while carousing with his concubines, he looked on, while some 800 of his subjects were crucified; their wives and children were slaughtered while they themselves looked on from their crosses.

This wretched tyrant, a chronic inebriate also, died in 78 B. C. On his deathbed he advised his queen, Salome-Alexandra, to seek the support of the Pharisees. She had withstood his madness as far as she could, and she had some reputation for Jewish piety. The Pharisees now became the ruling element and persecuted or favored whom they liked. The feud between her two sons boded ill for the future. The older Hyrcanus II was good-natured, peaceable, but somewhat sleepy; Hyrcanus the younger, Aristobulus II, was fiery, energetic, and ambitious. Tigranes, of Armenia, "King of Kings," had virtually absorbed what was left of the empire of Seleucus Nicator; it was the time when Rome determined to make an end of her greatest enemy in Asia, Mithradates of Pontus. Into this conflict Tigranes was drawn, but was humbled by Lucullus in 69 B. C. Him Pompey succeeded, and to his tribunal in Damascus the Hasmonaean brothers resorted in 64 B. C.

Now Antipater the Idumaean (of Ascalon) had



become the Warwick behind the weaker brother, Hyrcanus, and Pompey, with the unerring tact of Roman imperialism, decided for the latter; Aristobulus held the temple mount and Pompey captured it after stubborn defense, on the Day of Atonement, 63 B. C., September 22 (in Cicero's consular year). There was much bloodshed, but Pompey rigorously abstained from looting any temple funds. Aristobulus was taken to Rome to grace the triumph, by and by, while Judaea, with the shadowy Hyrcanus as High Priest, became tributary to the Roman *aerarium*.

With Antipater and his energetic and ambitious second son, Herodes, begins the last, or Roman, period of Jewish history. Josephus, Herod's historian (for us), an aristocrat of Hasmonean blood, has drawn heavily on Nicolaus of Damascus, a close contemporary of Augustus, and counsellor, in many a difficult or dangerous situation, of his friend Herod. Nicolaus however was much more than a mere advocate or eulogist. Josephus also drew freely on Livy and on Strabo's continuation of Polybius.

To speak concisely, the two Idumaeans became, in turn, viceroys for Caesar, Antony, and Caesar Augustus. Of Pompey's subjection of Jerusalem, Josephus writes thus: "We lost our freedom and became subjects of the Romans; and the land we had acquired with our own arms, having taken it from the Syrians, this we were compelled to return to the Syrians; and in addition the Romans in a short time collected from us more than 10,000 talents" (*op. cit.* xiv, 7:1).<sup>12</sup> During Caesar's *Bellum Alexandrinum* (especially in 47 B. C.) Antipater rendered great service to the dictator, and was appointed vice-regent (ἐπίτροπος) of Judaea. He rebuilt the walls destroyed by Pompey, and young

<sup>12</sup> When Crassus in 54 B. C. was preparing his Parthian campaign he looted the temple, confiscating some 2,000 talents worth. *Antiqq.* xiv, 7:1.

Herod, at twenty-three or so, was made governor of Galilee. Cassius, some time after the Ides of March, 44, imposed staggering war contributions on the East. About this time Antipater died of poison. Herod was summoned before the Sanhedrin for some ruthless executions in Galilee. He appeared with soldiers and marked for destruction later those who had called him to account. After Philippi (Nov.-Dec., 42 B. C.) he became a devoted follower of Mark Antony, often compelled to match all his craft against that of Cleopatra.<sup>13</sup>

When Pacorus, crown prince of Parthia, in 40 B. C. (*Antiqq.* xiv, 13:3) overran Syria, he entered Jerusalem and replaced there the pretender Antigonus, son of Aristobulus II, who had promised the Parthians 1,000 talents and 500 Jewesses. Now Herod, though he had a son by a plebeian wife, Doris, had engaged to marry Mariamme, a lady of great beauty and royal bearing, a granddaughter both of Aristobulus and of Hyrcanus, the hostile brothers of the critical year 63 B. C. Pacorus held sway in the Holy City. But Herod made good his escape to Egypt, whence he sailed for Rhodes, there fitted out a trireme of his own, landed at Brundisium, and hastened to Rome. The Romans were of course nervous about Parthia. Carrhae was fairly recent. The rule of a Romanist was plainly in the Roman interest at the time. So Herod was readily, with the warm support of both Antony and Octavian, invested with the title of King. On returning, he first aided Antony's eastern campaign, having a conference with him at Samosata, in 38 B. C. But in the next year, 37, he marries Mariamme, and gains Jerusalem. The

---

<sup>13</sup> Herod himself left memoirs (*ἀπομνημονεύματα*) which Josephus used, with sober judgment. (*Cf. Antiqq.* xv, 6:3.)

hapless Hasmonaeon, Antigonus, at Antioch, was scourged and beheaded by Antony's verdict.

From this point forward, every High Priest at Jerusalem held the place entirely at the pleasure of King Herod, who in turn held his "throne" at the pleasure, first of Antony and after September 2, 31 B. C., of Augustus. Herod first appointed as High Priest a Jew from the Babylonian *Diaspora*, Ananel, and after a year he replaced him by a youth of sixteen, a brother of Queen Mariamme's, a youth of quite extraordinary charm of physical loveliness. His name was Aristobulus, and his misfortune was that he was the last Hasmonaeon in the male line. So, in the very next year, the hapless youth was drowned at Jericho, as though by his own fault. Of course, Herod, in this and similar crimes, always concealed his own hand, arch-intriguer that he was. The feelings of the Queen Mariamme and her mother Alexandra may easily be imagined. If we may believe Nicolaus-Strabo-Josephus, in the pre-Actian times (to Sept. 2, 31 B. C.) Antony was the real overlord of Herod, but the latter's troubles sometimes were with the arch-temptress of the Nile, Cleopatra herself. Antony, however, in the end, was always the humble slave of her philters. To her personal perquisites, we might add, belonged the palm-groves of Jericho and the balsam plantations of that region<sup>14</sup>, which Herod in turn was obliged to lease from her.

During the world crisis of the Actium campaign, Herod luckily had a commission to bring to terms Malchus of Arabia Petraea, then in arrears with his

<sup>14</sup> Φέρει δ' ἡ χώρα τὸ βάλαμον, ὃ τιμώτατον τῶν ἐκεῖ καὶ παρὰ μύθοις φέρεται, τὸν δὲ φοῖνικα πολλὸν καὶ καλόν (*Antiqq.* xv, 4:2. Cf. also Horace: *Ep.* II, 2:184, *cur alter fratrum . . . praeferas Herodis palmetis pinguibus . . .*



tribute to Antony and Cleopatra. After Octavian's decisive victory, September 2, 31 B. C., Herod hastened to Rhodes, and laid all he had and was at the feet of the victor, and returned stronger than ever (*op. cit.* xv, 6:7). For Octavian's march into Egypt he contributed funds and troops (30 B. C.). At this point Herod's sister Salome incessantly fanned his jealous fear against his Queen, Mariamme, until he gave orders for her execution (29 B. C.) Her two sons remained, young boys then, but in time this cruel crime was bound to affect all their lives and trend of sentiment. Herod was a consistent Romanist, of course. He established *Augustalia*, athletic games to be held once in four years (*op. cit.* xv, 8:1). A theater in Jerusalem and an amphitheater near by, were bound bitterly to offend Jewish customs and laws. There were also chariot races. Inscriptions in the theater glorified the deeds of his patron Augustus. There were established wild beast shows, condemned criminals being pitted against lions. His mercenaries in the *Antonia* overawed all muttering of the capital. Samaria was splendidly rebuilt and fortified, and renamed Sebaste (Augusta). The new walls had a perimeter of twenty stadia. "Straton's Tower" on the coast was by dint of huge engineering works made into a great port with a basin for shipping surpassing the Piraeus of Athens, and renamed Caesarea. (*Bellum Judaicum* I, 408 *sqq.*) All this, as Josephus notes (*Antiqq.* xv, 9:1), of course involved crushing taxation in Palestine. He was a lavish patron also of the Greeks, for games, public works, temples, as in Rhodes, Nicopolis (Actium), nay even at that Panhellenic spot, Olympia in Elis (*op. cit.* xvi, 5:3.)

But he, not unwisely, planned some measure of re-

covering the good-will of his Jewish subjects. He planned a virtual rebuilding of the temple at Jerusalem. It was all designed, and in the main carried out within three years, 19-17 B. C. We cannot here even summarize the detail in Josephus (xv, 11). He, a faithful and consistent Jew, calls it simply "The Temple of God." Herod, indeed, reckoned on an enduring dynastic memorial, and hoped to ingratiate himself with the Jews, perhaps even with their *ultras*, the Pharisees. His official pronouncements, in phrase, were unctuously pious; it was to be a thank-offering to God, he said. One thousand carts were provided and 10,000 laborers. New foundations, then blocks of "white stone," cyclopean in their vastness,<sup>15</sup> for they were 25 cubits long, 8 in height, about 12 in width. Then too, new curtains, great arcades, or colonnades (*στώαι*). The whole was designed to give each side one stadium in length, the four sides having thus a perimeter of about half a mile in our measure.

In 18 B. C. Herod visited Rome to bring back his (and Mariamme's) sons, who then were about eighteen and sixteen years old respectively. And now his brother Pheroras and his sister Salome began their molework of planning the ultimate destruction of Aristobulus and Alexander, before they could succeed in Palestine. Antipater, the older brother by the commoner (socially speaking) wife, Doris, was even more interested in this wicked design. In the end there were conferences, as in 11 B. C., before Augustus himself. Herod charged that they planned to poison him, and then divide Palestine. But the *Princeps* brought about a peaceful settlement and some kind of reconciliation.

---

<sup>15</sup> Cf. on the imposing majesty of the whole the attestation of our Lord's disciples, Matt. 24:1ff; Mk. 23:1. Cf. also Luke 21:5; Acts 3:11.

(*Bellum Judaicum* I, 452 sqq.) Returning home then, in 11 B. C., Herod officially bestowed insignia of royalty on all three. But the wicked Antipater wished to be sole heir to his father. The efforts of Archelaus of Cappadocia (whose daughter Glaphyra was married to one of the princes of Palestine) to reconcile all were vain. In Herod's reign, too, there were, though rarely, brief periods when the skies of Augustan favor were lowering or overcast. But the counsel and the adroitness of his friend and often envoy Nicolaus of Damascus, always proved successful in the end.

The almost photographic and dramatic detail in Josephus' *Archaeologia* on this long drawn out tragedy in the family of the Idumaeen King of Palestine is, in the main, a transcript from the last twenty-four of the 144 books of the *Historiae* of the same Nicolaus. In dealing with his patron and royal friend Herod, the Damascene Hellenist always emphasized what favored the fame, and always concealed or mitigated what tended to the disgrace, of the ruler of Palestine. (Josephus: *Antiqq.* xvi, 7: 1.)

Finally in 6 B. C., through the lies and forgeries of a "*Graeculus esuriens*," a Spartan Eurycles, Herod was convinced that Mariamme's sons had planned his removal by poison. Calling a council to sit at Beyrout, authorized by Augustus, in 6 B. C., Herod personally acted as chief prosecutor, while the princes were absent and not represented by pleaders. Salome and Pheroras sat among the judges. Only one of the judges, the Roman Saturninus, voted for acquittal. The princes then were transported to Sebaste (Samaria), strangled there, and entombed in their maternal grandfather's mausoleum, the Alexandreion.

But Herod lived too long for Antipater's greedy ambition. The latter even had in his pay Akme, a waiting woman or maid in the household of the Em-



press Livia in Rome. He went to Rome himself, on a manipulated summons, probably to be sure of his ground. But before he completed his return voyage to Palestine, all came to be revealed to the wretched father. The chief assessor, in the decisive hearings of the would-be parricide Antipater, was the then proconsul of Syria, Quintilius Varus,<sup>16</sup> and Nicolaus of Damascus, who incorporated everything in his later history. Despatches from Augustus permitted Herod to impose exile or death. Although the Idumaeen, then about seventy years old, was suffering from a cruel enteric disease, tortured to the verge of suicide, he had what satisfaction there was (after gaining overwhelming proof of Antipater's poison plot) in ordering his bodyguard to execute his oldest son. When his own demise was quite certain, he issued an edict that representative men from every village in Judaea should be summoned and held in the hippodrome of Jericho until his own death. "I know," he said to his sister Salome, "that the Jews will rejoice at my death, making it a national holiday; I will provide them with a cause for national mourning." His soldiers were to spear them to death. But his successor, Archelaus, did not wish to begin in this way, having, then at least, the fear of Augustus in his soul.

We must close this brief narrative with an incident connected with, nay caused by, his death, that is, by the rumor that he was dead. Two eminent teachers of the Law (the "scribes" of the New Testament) Judas and Matthias, heard of the King's incurable disease, and presented it to their classes as the punishment by God of Herod's many transgressions of the Law.

---

<sup>16</sup> The same who fifteen years later perished in the Teutoburg Forest in Germany, together with his three legions (Strabo 291, Casaubon).

Then they called the attention of their students to the great golden eagle which Herod had placed as a *donarium* (and perhaps in honor of Rome) over the main portal of the temple, contrary to the Jewish laws (Deut. 5: 8: "Thou shalt make no image," etc.); such an abomination should be removed, even at the cost of life itself. A rumor spread through the city that the King had died. So these young law students went up at high noon, and, letting themselves down with long leather straps, cut down the "idolatrous" eagle with axes. When brought before their Idumaeen King, these young zealots, some forty with their two professors, were not at all cowed in that presence, claiming that they had obeyed God and Moses in what they had done. Herod bitterly reproved them because they did not appreciate the fact that he had done infinitely more for the temple than all the Hasmonaeans in their 125 years before his own accession (164-39 B. C.). They, the students of the Law, had committed gross sacrilege! The verdict of the furious dying King was that those students who had hacked down the eagle, and their two preceptors, were to be burned at the stake; all the others who had been arrested in connection with the riot were put to death in other ways.

Josephus, especially in his *Archaeologia*, has incorporated a very great number of official documents bearing on his own race. These documents have been, I need not say, examined by eminent scholars, such as Fr. Ritschl (in *Rheinisches Museum*, 1873, vol. 28, reprinted in his *Opuscula* v, 99 sqq.), and the noted editor of Josephus, Benedictus Niese (in *Hermes* vol. xi, 1876, p. 466 sqq.), has examined this matter with great care.

I will at once, with my limitations of space, say that while the genuineness of these documents seems incontestable, their connection with the context is often slight or nil. We must never forget this: Josephus throughout is the great apologist, nay, advocate and pleader, for his unfortunate race. He knew,

better than most men of his generation (before and after 70 A. D.) what Israel had had to endure, both at home and in the *Diaspora* after the first exile, down to Titus, that is, to the political extinction of Judaea. He desired to show, by documentary evidence, that the Jews had received peculiar and important franchises and privileges, first from the Roman Senate, and later, from Caesar, from Mark Antony, from Augustus, and from Agrippa the victor of Actium, friend, counsellor, and *adfinis* of that eminent ruler himself, and a warm personal friend of King Herod.

Now Josephus simply could not dovetail all these documents into his actual narrative. His great aim was to publish them, no matter how, and thus preserve for his co-religionists in all the Roman Empire irrefragable proofs of their religious self-determination. Such was doubly necessary after Jerusalem and the temple were no more. In modern times, I believe, he would have preserved them all in an appendix. To me, with all respect for the great scholar (whom it was my privilege to hear and to know fifty years ago) it seems unnecessary to conclude with Fr. Ritschl (*loc. cit.* p. 14), dass der ganze spätere Teil der Josephischen Archæologie nie zu einer abschliessenden Redaktion gelangt ist." As regards the genuineness of these documents, Josephus was well aware that for most of them verification was entirely feasible, and that forgery or invention would have discredited or simply ruined his *Apologia pro Gente sua*; for such that work is, both in design and effect.

We must not re-edit them here, but may call attention to the fact that apart from the *aera*, or bronze tablets, of *Senatus consulta*, the records in the old archives of the High Priest in Jerusalem were, or had been, often transcribed for the *Diaspora* throughout the Roman Empire.

Let the reader therefore examine that decree which Caesar in Egypt, 47 B. C., caused the Senate at Rome to adopt (*Antiqq.* xiv, 8:5) where we find, *inter alia*, the regular formulary, *scribendo adfuerunt* with the tribus-name of each Senator, also the place of the particular session, Temple of Concordia on Forum; the time, Ides of December, etc., etc.; also the corresponding date of the Jewish year, under Hyrcanus, "High Priest and Ethnarch," is appended. The largest collection now found is in Josephus xiv, 1-26, all exhibiting, as Josephus puts it, "the friendship and alliance with the Romans," on the part of Jerusalem (*ibid.* par. 26 *fin.*) Thus a decree addressed to the municipal government of Sidon, praising the services of



the Jews in the *Bellum Alexandrinum* (47 B. C.), confirming the title of the High Priest and his descendants, and protecting the peculiar laws of the Jews. There is to be no exaction of special tax or quartering of troops in winter on Jews residing in Sidon. This decree of Caesar to be deposited in a bilingual form, "Greek and Roman." In another decree of Caesar (par. 6) the Jews are exempted from any tax on crops in their "so-called Sabbatical year." Communities in the Greek archipelago of the Aegean (par. 8) are warned not to interfere with the religious usages of Jewish dwellers, or against collecting special funds therefor, or inhibiting their community festivals, "since they enjoy these privileges in Rome too." At Ephesus Dolabella exempted the Jews there from military conscription on account of their Sabbath, and he recognized their dietary laws (par. 12). Certain parts one can readily turn back into the original Latin: Pro tribunali, superstitionis causa [ δεισιδαιμονίας ἕνεκα ] a militando absolvi . . . ante xii d. Kalendas Octobres Lucio Lentulo Gaio Marcello consulibus.

A similar decree is sent to Delos, while *Sardis* is warned to take notice (par. 14). The insular community of Cos is similarly warned (par. 15), and also told that the Roman Senate desires unhindered travel to Jerusalem for Jews taking Cos en route. At Sardis the Jews are to have their own assembly (σύνδος) in accordance with their ancestral laws (par. 17), also, that they are to settle their own controversies (ἀντιλογίας) themselves. The formula, δεισιδαιμονίας ἕνεκα, the Greek for the Roman *superstitionis causa*, occurs several times in these Roman official monitions. The people of Laodicea acknowledge receipt of a similar order from the Roman provincial capital of "Asia," an order which the Laodiceans promise to conserve in their municipal archives (par. 20). The people of Tralles are warned to respect the Jewish customs as to Sabbaths and as to the handling of their own produce. A very elaborate *psephisma* of Pergamum, once the famous capital of the Attalidae (Strabo 623-625), deals with Jewish rights there, conformably with a *Senatus consultum* of Rome (par. 22). As a rule, complaints, if any, were issued from the central Jewish authority, *i. e.*, the High Priest at Jerusalem.

Herod, in his day, was very active in these same matters. He advocated, with Agrippa himself, the maintenance of Jewish privileges in "Asia," the province, and in the Aegean islands governed from Ephesus (*Antiqq.* xvi, 1: 3). There were chiefly these points: The untrammelled sending of funds to Jerusalem,

attendance in court on Sabbaths and on other "holidays," sharing in military service (conscription?), drawing on synagogue funds for local burdens, and, above all, the spiteful treatment and contumely (*ἐπηρεάζεσθαι*) to which the Jews were much subjected, both socially and politically, especially in the communities of the Hellenistic world. Now the *Imperium Romanum* and the *Pax Romana* were blessings which Herod's friend and spokesman, Nicolaus the Damascene, in his plea before Agrippa, brought out, clearly, pointedly, adroitly, but also truly enough. Agrippa in the end gave his official approval then and there, on the island of Lesbos, in the presence of a great convocation of representative Greeks from the entire province of "Asia." To this we may add the case of the Jews in Cyrenaica where they likewise had suffered much from the "inhumanity" (*ἀπανθρωπία*) of the Greeks. (*Antiqq.* xvi, 6:1 *sqq.*) But I will close this matter as well as this entire monograph with a partial citation of a decree issued by Augustus himself (*Antiqq.* xvi, 6:2; date not given by Josenhus), wherein the High Priest is designated as the Priest of the "Highest God" (*θεὸς ὑψιστος*):

"—and their sacred funds shall be inviolable [*ἐν ἀσυλῇ*] and sent up to Jerusalem and be paid over 'to the receivers of Jerusalem [*τοῖς ἀποδοχέουσιν*]' and they [the Jews anywhere] shall not give legal security on the Sabbaths, or on the Day of Preparation preceding [*τῆς παρασκευῆς*]<sup>17</sup> from the ninth hour on [3 P. M.]. And if any one is caught stealing their sacred books from the synagogue [*σαββατεῖον*] or from the men's room [*ἀνδρῶν*] such a one shall be a sacrilegious criminal [*ιερόσυλος*, equivalent to looter of a sacred shrine] and his fortune shall be conveyed to the Public Treasury of the Romans."

NEW YORK.

---

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Luke 23:24, "and that day was the Preparation."

## THE RE-CREATING OF THE INDIVIDUAL

By ROBERT P. WILDER, General Secretary, Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions

SOCIETY cannot be reconstituted or improved until a sufficient number of individuals have been changed or transformed.

The nineteenth century gave to the world a number of human betterment schemes. After the industrial revolution in the beginning of that century a whole set of philosophers began to turn their attention to the amelioration of the lot of the masses. In England and on the Continent different schools or social creeds arose which had as their goal the sweeping glorification of entire classes of people. They were eager to effect tremendous changes in human living conditions and to elevate the masses, and they expected to do this by wholesale propaganda, by broadsides of theory applied directly to raw life, by dissemination of the literature of uplift. Social service was born, and the settlement movement originated. Schools of new theory were founded, colonies were established on the utopian plan, and the rising generation in colleges and universities were taught social science. Young people who felt they had a "mission in life" were swept into the ranks of those who went a-slumming. Brotherhood was preached for the sake of brotherhood.

The first quarter of the present century was in the act of passing with no diminution in the stream of utopians marching under those banners, yet, to many who considered themselves of "an older generation" in thinking, a gleam of something different seemed to be



showing. Old-fashioned theology had made much of the individual. It had emphasized conversion; it had regarded as most essential the relationship of a soul to its Maker. What it saw of duty to others was the result of the divine command to love thy brother as thyself. It never ceased to wage the battle of personal sin. That this sin was put by the social creeds as the burden upon all mankind, or sin of class against class, was as nothing to theology.

Do we call this old-fashioned? In the language of many of the astute youth of the first two decades of the twentieth century it was so termed. They modeled themselves after larger world patterns, saw themselves as merely representative of class, and sought a humanitarian duty, as such, in class improvement. All movements to elevate the condition of the poor, model tenements, equal suffrage, child labor, were regarded as crusades by modern youth.

This tendency did not surfeit itself until after the World War. That war resulted in the partial collapse of every world-wide crusade of universal brotherhood and betterment of class as against class, regardless of national boundaries. It set the youth of the world to harder thinking. Some have come out of it with refurbished ideas of human betterment *per se*, of youth movements for the elevation of morals, politics, religion, etc. Still other young people are entering upon paths which lead to the psychological analysis of life. They are plumbing the science of knowledge, of the working out of living matter as it affects men's actions, motives, wills, and so on. Others are hunting among old religious systems and philosophies, comparing what the various religions have to offer for the solution of life's problem.

Still others are turning their questions to God, and

trying to obtain a right working relationship with Him, before solving their relations with men and the world. They are not less interested than before in the solution of international, interracial, and social problems, but they realize the need of more spiritual power in their own lives if they are to render vital help in solving them. With this latter group we have to deal.

My comings and goings for several years have brought me into close fellowship with young people of college age. Their problems have been mine and have lain so heavily upon my heart that many of the confidences imparted to me can never be violated by being put down on paper. Nevertheless, out of all the questioning which has gone up, there evolves a composite of the modern student as he or she is when face to face with the reality of living. Suppose we show forth this actual student through excerpts from letters which have really been written by students during the recent past.

One is from a Canadian student who says: "The swing is surely back to the positive life, the realities; problems are the problems of living aright within oneself. May I say in my own testimony, you have led me to give myself more to personal man-to-man work. I was in a quandary. Light is coming and I do ask your continued prayers. I have re-discovered my first purpose and it's joy to find myself ready simply to trust when I once was trying to prove, prove all the way."

Another is from a woman medical student who says: "We prayed together, the first time we ever did and she said she begged Christ for forgiveness though she had no right to ask it; then we went down to the fireside. I do wish you might have been there for that meeting. Oh, it was wonderful! . . . The very first one who spoke of the students was ———. She said she had

seen Him and had felt Him, and now she was going to be different with His help. We felt as though Christ Himself had spoken in our midst."

Still another woman student says: "Christ was there in a way which many of us had never experienced before. I cannot imagine anything more real or more perfect than was that time together, there in that beautiful little out-door chapel."

What is needed is to give Jesus the central place, and by that I mean not merely Jesus Christ the Teacher, but Jesus Christ the Saviour and Lord, for "there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved." The swing of the pendulum is away from the collective problem to a sense of personal need. Students are beginning to realize that they cannot help materially in the solution of international and interracial problems unless they have victory in their own lives; then they can go full steam ahead. For instance, a medical student said that there was only one place in this world where he shrank from laboring, namely, Africa, and that his board had asked him if he would work in that field. At once the interracial problem assumed new proportions for him; it became personal. After a conflict in his soul, Christ won the victory, and he told me that it would be for him a very real disappointment if his board sent him to any field but Africa.

A theological student says: "The Indianapolis Convention of the Student Volunteer Movement started a great surge into problems that had to be solved, but along with it has come the sense of impotence in not having the spiritual depth to carry through. I know that, to a large number of us, it drove into prayer."

Another theological student says: "When I preach



nothing happens. When I pray nothing happens. I will not be a powerless preacher. Should I not give up studying for the ministry and go into business?" I asked him if he thought God wanted a man like that in business, and advised him to seek to obtain the power that he lacked. This, I believe, he has done, and now he is ready to help solve world problems.

Are these not hopeful signs? They seem to show that students are not less interested than formerly in the right solution of world problems, but that they revolt against superficial solutions. They want society changed, but they realize that, in order to bring about this result, individuals who make up society must first be changed by the power of Christ.

Yet even as we deal with individuals, quote them, and are led to observe certain tendencies in their actions and utterances, we know so little about them. There are unexplored depths that require that we first plumb them before setting up observations about trends of thoughts and belief developments among our fellow men. The striving is ever to get right with God, and through God other lonely souls are reached. By way of the triangular route, which links us to our brothers through God, we are able to carry on human betterment.

Each generation achieves and transmits something to the next. This succession of generations has gradually produced through time an inheritance for modern man. "What thou didst inherit from thy sires, in order to possess it, must be won," said Goethe. Those who are born from among generations of parents who have been professing men of God, inherit a collective consciousness which approaches, but does not necessarily indicate, a personal consciousness of God.

What then is the path for the individual to take?

It is the path of moral responsibility. We recognize that the determinants of our destiny lie with us, when tied up to the power which is poured into us from a Supreme Being, the creative capacity for the achievement of a higher consciousness and a more abundant life. Mankind possesses many desires. But there is one great and universal urge expressed in all religion, in all art and philosophy, and in all human life; that is the wish to pass beyond himself, as he now is, a striving for further attainment, for a new consciousness or a new state of being. This new consciousness is the personal relation to be achieved between the individual and his God. In the attainment of this relation we find the consciousness of sin, deep introversion, pain, and struggle.

Christ's sacrifice for the sins of mankind is what makes Christianity supreme among religions, and His call for the regeneration of mankind is what makes His cult the most difficult of all. If we are to be one of His, we must take up our cross and follow Him, but He also promises us full and abundant life—life eternal. It is that into which we enter when we are born again.

Having made that supreme decision, which carries us over into His ranks, we must nurture ourselves in that grace. We need food, air, rest, and exercise in the spiritual life as well as in the physical. Through Bible reading, prayer, meditation, and worship we gain spiritual food and air; through contact with spiritual people and development in a warm religious atmosphere we relax and recuperate; and through Christian adventure, vocation, and hazardous undertakings, we gain exercise. Of these the most important is the practice of prayer. No faith can live without the Heavenly atmosphere breathed daily and even hourly. The supply of spiritual food must be constant in order that the

man may vitalize every act of the day with the will of God, his Master.

But it requires great will power to maintain the perfect discipline of worship in the whirl and hurry of modern life. Nothing is easier than to allow this necessary practice to be pushed aside by the petty, but insistent, demands of a busy day.

Meditation and worship are best experienced in places of beauty, quiet, remoteness, or hallowed by some special significance. Some men worship best out-of-doors, in forest, field or on mountain top. Some gaze out from their windows at a panorama of snow-covered roofs and distant sky, and raise their thoughts to God. Students have the freedom of campus or the knowledge of particular haunts. Some slip quietly into deserted churches that happen to be open at odd hours. Worship is the tuning of the soul to God, and the souls of the faithful must often be set to the pitch of God's universe. Worship is the way to do it, and so the technique of worship is one of our most vital studies.

Rest and recuperation spiritually are relaxation of tension, letting go of yourself in order to merge with the self of God. Great crises and small ones come up in every life; to weather them successfully we must be well rested physically and spiritually or they will eat into our reserve.

Finally we end with considering adventure and exercise. "Take up your cross and follow me." What do you think that means? It means your faith in God must be sturdy enough to withstand suffering; that you must be able and willing to make sacrifices for your faith and to face ridicule. Think of the possibilities of adventure in social service when it is illuminated and shot through with a romantic Christian faith. This is



what is called the dream of the idealist and is alleged to be unreal. But whatever men may say to the contrary, the ideal or spiritual world is the only real world, the only world in which man can be truly alive.

In closing I would like to quote an anecdote about the rebirth of an individual. In a village church in England one Sunday the pastor spoke on the text, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." Among the audience was a nobleman, Sir Vivyan, who was so deeply impressed by the force of the text that he became very restless and troubled, not knowing how this change to a new being was to be made. Although a man morally good and from his childhood familiar with Scripture, he realized that he must get clear about this vital truth, so he invited the pastor to dinner.

After dinner, upon being questioned about the new birth, the pastor started to quote Scripture, but the host's insistent question, "How can I be born again?" confused him. He saw that here was a case where his theological intelligence was insufficient; here was a really awakened man craving for the truth about salvation which he could not supply. Here could only experienced reality give light. "Yes," he said, "there are differences of opinion on that point among the theological schools." "Oh, please let us leave out the theological schools," replied the nobleman, almost angry. "Tell me, I pray you, how can I be born again, and who has experienced this change in himself? In short, are you—?" The heavy table shook as the strong man began this personal question. He trembled and was unable to finish the question. But the pastor understood. He dropped his head and covered his pale face with both hands.

Now there was a deadly silence for some time. Then the pastor arose and with tears in his eyes said: "My dear friend, let us pray." Sir Vivyan understood; they were both not yet born again. And there and then they bent their knees together and cried to God for mercy, for salvation and eternal life, and received the answer from Him who had said, "All that the Father giveth me shall come to me; and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out." For several weeks the pastor was not seen in the pulpit, but when he took his old place again, how different was his preaching! He could speak now in the power of the Holy Spirit, of the Saviour, and of the gift of eternal life, now really his own.

"Whosoever will, let him take of the water of life freely."

NEW YORK.

## THE NEW WORLD OF ISLAM

By DR. SAMUEL M. ZWEMER, Editor of *The Moslem World*

THE missionary enterprise faces new conditions everywhere, but in no section of the world are they so startling as in Mohammedan lands. If one could stand on one of the lofty minarets of the great Azhar University Mosque, at Cairo, and look eastward, westward, northward, and southward over the vast areas dominated by Islam for thirteen centuries, nothing would so impress the thoughtful observer as the fact that the old empire of Mohammed has become almost unrecognizable because of changes from without and from within.

Islam was cradled in the desert and bore the imprint of its environment—stern, ruthless, intolerant, awful, immutable, inevitable—for many centuries. In 907 A. D. the bounds of the Caliphate included the whole of Turkestan, Persia, all of western India, as well as Arabia, North Africa, and Spain. Well might the ruler of so vast a domain call himself Suliman the Magnificent. Today we witness the remnants of the old Turkish Empire, Arabia, Mesopotamia, Egypt, Palestine, struggling in the throes of a new nationalism, eager for democracy and none bold or strong enough to save the Caliphate when the Turks themselves abolished the office and deported the last of Ottoman Caliphs. The situation is described by Moslems themselves in language that borders on pessimism.

"There has been many a dark hour in the history of Islam," said Khawaja Nazir Ahmad, preaching in the Woking Mosque, June 14, 1924, "but never any so dark



as the present. We, the present-day Moslems, have indeed fallen on evil days. Our past glory has forsaken us. Our might, our honor, have deserted us. To our rivals, our days are already numbered. It is true that, to a certain extent, we have awakened and realized the critical nature of the situation in which we find ourselves; but like a man who has been enjoying a deep slumber and is awakened, all of a sudden, by some turmoil around him, we are rushing about in utter darkness to avoid what we perceive to be an imminent danger. Confusion has seized our senses; and though the danger is within our purview, yet we cannot properly locate it. Death is staring us in the face, and the struggle for self-preservation has just begun."

The Egyptian papers recently published a cartoon showing Kemal Pasha perched in the top of a high palm tree bearing the word "Caliphate" and sawing through the trunk below him. Beneath the tree stands a man in a mantle and turban, representing the old world of Islam, warning him with great alarm of his peril. The unbounded popularity of the Angora government in Egypt and India has vanished. Turkey has isolated herself not only from the rest of Islam by her recent action, but she has thrown down the challenge to educated Mohammedans everywhere also to separate church and state and to substitute nationalism for pan-Islamic ideals. The situation compels Moslem leaders to reconsider religious positions formerly accepted as axiomatic. Great perplexity exists in the minds of the masses. The Mohammedans of Bengal first contended that the news about the Caliphate was a "lie of Reuters," or if true the news must be good since the Turks can only do the right thing. Now they are awake to the facts and so depressed that Seyyid Amir Ali writes:

"The so-called 'abolition' of the Caliphate will, I fear, give rise to grave unrest among the unadvanced communities and at the same time will create discord among all Moslem nations, and lead to the disintegration of Islam as a moral force united hitherto by one common ideal. The semi-civilized may eventually be drawn into the meshes of revolution and disorder.

"Islam by its discipline and rules of conduct maintains social order and sobriety and consecrates family life and private ownership of property. For it to lose its force, especially among these communities, will have a disastrous effect on civilization and progress."

The Moslem magazine, *Light*, published at Lahore, describes the new situation in the Moslem world with equal alarm: "Is not Islam involved today in a life-and-death struggle? Is there one nook of the globe or one corner where hostile forces in all their might, are not up against Islam? Can you point to one Moslem land from Morocco to the Malay, from the inaccessible heart of Africa to the forbidding confines of Central Asia, where the heel or, to say the least, the thumb of one usurper or another is not enslaving the Mussulman in body, and corrupting him in soul?"

One could multiply such testimony, but we ask rather, What is the significance of this "life-and-death struggle" to Christianity? The answer was given at the remarkable series of conferences of Christian workers among Mohammedans, recently held in the Near East and North Africa under the auspices of the International Missionary Council by Dr. John R. Mott, and at similar conferences in India. United opinion was, that missions face an entirely new situation and one of great promise.

In the Near East post-war conditions have altered

the missionary problem to an amazing degree. "Whole classes of people who never before could be reached by the message of Christ have now become physically and spiritually accessible."

At the Jerusalem Conference it was agreed that, of the population of the Moslem world which numbers 234,314,989, "we find that no less than four-fifths are now increasingly accessible to every method of missionary approach. This is true, for example, of all British India, the Dutch East Indies, Persia, Mesopotamia, China, the Balkans, the whole of North Africa, and Central, East and West Africa, with the possible exception of Northern Nigeria. In some lands where work is hindered or prevented by government the people themselves would welcome Christian missionaries if the restrictions were removed."

From nearly every part of the field we have reports of a new willingness to hear the Gospel message, a responsive spirit and much less antagonism than in former days. Even in the Azhar University, Cairo, it has been possible for us to distribute the printed message in tract and Gospel portion form. The number of inquirers is increasing everywhere, and public baptisms are not only possible but more frequent, even in Arabia. Among the educated classes some, especially young men, have lost their moorings and are adrift on a sea of unbelief. Now is the supreme opportunity for winning these future leaders for Christ.

In what respect then, we may well ask, do we face a new world situation?

1. It is a new world of Islam because Islam has entered the new world. Carefully prepared statistics show that Islam is found in all the five continents. In North America there are scattered groups numbering



it is true twelve thousand only, but active in their propaganda through *The Moslem Sunrise*, published in Chicago. In South America, *i. e.*, Brazil, Argentine, Guadeloupe, and Guiana, there are over one hundred and ninety thousand Mohammedans. In France the number of Moslems is increasing; in Paris alone there are nearly three thousand. Southeastern Europe still has an acute Moslem problem. Albania has 830,000 Moslems; Bulgaria, 672,500; Greece, 450,000. Under Russian rule the latest statistics give 15,200,000 Moslems in the Caucasus and Central Asia.

Islam challenges Europe and America by the activity of its propaganda in centers such as London, Berlin, Paris, and Chicago. It is true that this propaganda is conducted by a heterodox and modernistic Islam, the Ahmadiya sect, but it has a reflex influence in all countries. The conversion of Europeans and Americans to Islam has become a stock-in-trade argument against Christianity in Egypt and India. In Australia Moslems number over 25,000 and publish their own magazine. In the Philippine Islands our government census puts the number of Mohammedans at 586,999. These fringes of the Moslem world area are least in number statistically, but not therefore of least importance to Western Christendom.

Every country in Asia, save Japan and Korea, has its Moslem problem. In Bengal Province there are more Mohammedans than in all Egypt and Arabia. On the one island of Java there are over thirty-four million Mohammedans, while British India, according to the census of 1921, has 68,735,233. In Africa paganism is crumbling, but Islam is aggressive, ubiquitous, and is contesting with Christianity the destiny of a continent.

The missionary forces have, however, hitherto moved across or around this great Moslem bloc. The following areas or countries in which the population is wholly or predominantly Moslem are practically unoccupied, although the missionary conferences of Cairo, Edinburgh, and Lucknow successively laid them all before the church: Afghanistan,<sup>1</sup> the provinces Hejaz, Asir, Nejd, and Hadramut in Arabia, Russian Turkestan, parts of Siberia, Bokhara, the eastern part of the Malay Peninsula, Socotra, the Moslem populations of Madagascar, Russia in Europe, Tripoli in North Africa, the French Soudan, the Great Aures Mountains, the Saharan Atlas ranges, the central populous mountain regions of Morocco, and the vast Sahara itself. These unoccupied fields have a total population of approximately 36,000,000.

The Mohammedans of China, numbering at least eight million, have scarcely a missionary devoting himself entirely to this important element of the population. "Moslem India is in a very real sense an unoccupied field." This finding of the conference held at Jerusalem in April, 1924, was confirmed and emphasized in a series of regional conferences subsequently held by us during the summer of 1924 in the great cities of India. We face a new world because we know its vast proportions and must acknowledge our long neglect.

2. It is a new world of Islam because of new light thrown on its origin and character, its unity and dissensions, its vital theistic principles and backward Arabian ethics. The bibliography of Islam is becoming enormous. Orient and Occident have contributed of their ripe scholarship in translations of the Koran, of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Presbyterian missionaries from Persia have just gained entrance to Herat.

Traditions, and of the sources of Islamic history and jurisprudence. The grotesque ignorance or the inaccurate statements of earlier writers need no longer lead astray even the casual reader on this subject. The life of Mohammed, for example, now appears in the daylight of history and not in the moonshine of tradition, thanks to the labors of Grimme, Nöldeke, Hurgronje, Buhl, Lammens, Margoliouth, Tor Andrae, and more especially Goldziher and Leone Caetani. Their labors have abrogated much of the learning and lore enshrined in our popular histories and encyclopedias. Weil, Sprenger, Carlyle, and Muir no longer hold the keys to the problem of the Great Arabian.

The Koran too has lost its unique character as an Arabic classic, impressing the ignorant non-Arabs by its poetic cadence. The book has been translated into forty languages, is handled by the infidel, nay can be bought in sections as a gramophone record in the markets of Cairo and Calcutta. Professor Gustav Pfannmüller, in his *Hand-buch der Islam-Literatur*, gives a partial list of translations and versions in all the languages of Europe. Those which now appear in Bengali, Urdu, Marathi, Gujrati, Tamil, Javanese, and English, prepared by and for the Mohammedans themselves, are more significant as the harbinger of a new day. Some believe that the translation of the Koran into the chief vernaculars of Africa and Asia is a strategic missionary method. The Swahili version, by Canon Dale, at least goes far to prove its wisdom. As long as we have the Bible societies missionaries may welcome a polyglot Koran.

Ignorance of Islam and of the world it still dominates is inexcusable in the new day whose dawn "came up like thunder" during the war. The daily press, the



illustrated magazines, the theater, and even the cinema have brought Constantinople and Cairo, Mecca and the muezzin, Fatima and her sisters, the Thief of Bagdad and the honest exiled Caliph to our doors. The Near East Relief has not only carried our overflowing bread-basket to a million starving widows, orphans, and exiles, but has put the economic, social, and spiritual needs of the Near East in bold relief before a hundred million people. The Moslem world was never so near as it is today.

3. It is a new world because it is no longer stagnant. New movements, economic, social, intellectual, spiritual, are stirring everywhere. The currents run counter to each other and with terrific speed. Zionism, Bolshevism, commercialism, nationalism, imperialism, all have their interests centering in the undeveloped, unexploited Moslem Near East. Each is a disintegrating factor in the old world of thought and life. Turkey is turning her back on the past and is trampling on traditions that had the sanctity of age and religion. The cry of the reactionaries is back to the Koran and to Mohammed. The problem of the progressives is to get as far away from both as is decent and safe. The unity of the Moslem problem is nowhere seen more clearly than in this struggle of the old and new in the womb of a new day. It is similar in all lands from Java to Morocco. Whether reformed Islam will remain Islam was questioned by Lord Cromer two decades ago in his book on Modern Egypt. The question is now answered, but in the negative. The rise of new sects, Babi, Behai, Ahmadi, and the recrudescence of old sects, the Wahabis and the Ikhwan, also indicate a coming death struggle. The educational revival, the renaissance of Arabic as a world language through schools and universities, the

feminist movement, above all the enormous activity of Moslem journalism, co-operate to bring about new conditions of tolerance, accessibility, and responsiveness.

National and compulsory primary education for the masses is an ambitious program for countries where ninety-six per cent. of the men and ninety-nine per cent. of the women are still illiterate. Yet that is the slogan in the Cairo press and among the Mohammedan Nationalists of India. Their boundless faith is not without works. To give a single instance, on behalf of a group of Moslems Sir Fazulbhoy Currimbhoy has offered to the Bombay University ten lakhs of rupees, in three and a half per cent. government papers, for an endowment of university scholarships for Mohammedan students of the Bombay Presidency going to foreign countries for higher studies in medicine, philosophy, ancient history, Arabic literature, town planning, and technological and industrial subjects, as well as superior services.

Moslem Nationalist schools refusing state aid are springing up all over India. In Sumatra I visited private Moslem co-educational schools which were up-to-date and crowded. So great a number of public schools have been established by the French in Algeria and Tunisia that French is becoming the language not only of economic, but even of religious life in North Africa. Persia is awake to the need of education for the masses, and missionaries are training the future leaders of education in the only colleges that exist. The same is true of Mesopotamia. The American University at Cairo has pupils from Mecca, and King Feisul is asking for an American College at Bagdad.

"The shattering impact of the War itself," so we agreed at Jerusalem, "the rise of clamant nationalism

and race movements cutting across Pan-Islamic policy, the Bolshevik ferment, the Caliphate agitation, the increased government of Islamic peoples by European powers, the critical debate on the civilization of Christendom, the eastward spread of European scepticism, the rebellion against traditionalism and external authority, the hunger for knowledge of new scientific thought and invention, the canvassing of the status of Oriental womanhood, and some strong reactionary movements are all factors in producing a profound and widespread change that can be described soberly and with precision as epoch-making. The urgency of the need is quite as impressive as its range; for the present plasticity cannot be expected to continue indefinitely."

4. The ubiquity, activity, and enterprise of the Moslem press and journalism have created new opportunities and a new mentality among the masses. Provincialism is going. There lies before me a Malay weekly published by Mohammedans in Borneo. On a single page there is an article on Islam in America, another article on the New Mosque in Berlin, items regarding Aligarh College, Nationalism in Bengal, and an advertisement of a Javanese steamship company, that accommodates Borneo pilgrims for Mecca if they will embark at Padang, Sumatra. What clearer proof of the unity of the new world of Islam? The leading Arabic periodicals of Cairo have agents and readers everywhere. *Al Hilal* is one of the popular illustrated monthlies dealing with current events, science, art, and literature. Each number contains a department of questions and answers. In the current number those who use this open forum represent the following lands and cities: Katif, East Arabia; Nablous, Palestine; Utica, New York; Tanta, Egypt; Bagdad; Water-



bury, Connecticut; Montreal; Partos, Brazil; Syria; Mexico; and Java. The same magazine gives a list of a dozen foreign agencies, including Brazil and Persia. Among those who advertise in its columns are Syrians and Egyptians in Manchester, England, Berlin, and Rio de Janeiro. This unity of the Islamic world through the press has its advantages, but also its grave perils for Christian missions. The spread of missions into purely Moslem lands, for example the opening of Central Arabia and Afghanistan to medical missionaries, challenges the Moslem press. The Cairo Moslem papers reported the Edinburgh Conference and the plans for church union in Canada. An article appears in an Indian paper complaining of the success of Christian missions among the Moslems of Trinidad. A Singapore magazine finds encouragement in editorial exaggerations as follows:

“Today a great part of the inhabitants of the world claim to profess the religion of Islam. According to the latest estimate, the adherents of this creed amount to four hundred millions, not an insignificant fraction of the whole human race. In a comparatively brief space of 1,300 years the teachings of the Koran have taken a firm root in the hearts of such a vast multitude of men and have become their daily code. East or West, North or South, wherever the observer turns his eyes, his gaze invariably encounters at least some unit of this great brotherhood. Apart from the vast tracts of purely Moslem countries and the millions inhabiting China and Russia, one comes across the Polish-speaking Moslems in Lithuania, Dutch-speaking Moslems of Cape Colony and those inhabiting the West Indies and the Guianas, and last but not the least the

new adherents of the faith in the British Isles, North America, Australia and Japan."

5. Finally we must note that this new self-conscious half-educated world of Islam has found new weapons against the old Gospel. In this respect the situation is entirely new. The old Islam honored Jesus Christ as a great prophet, and although it denied His Deity and atoning death it always acknowledged His sinlessness and virgin birth. The New Islam denies the sinlessness of Jesus, mocks at the virgin birth, and brings proof from the writings of infidels and from modern destructive criticism that the Bible is a tissue of fables and myths. It is painful to read the articles written on these subjects by men who are graduates in some cases of Christian colleges. The infamous book by Mohammed Tannir, *Pagan Elements in Christianity*, is an example, unfortunately not unique. The late Mr. Howard Walter, in his admirable book on the Ahmadiya Movement, quotes the following passage from *The Review of Religions*, and adds, "Could deliberate blasphemy go to greater lengths?"

"The manner is very amusing in which the three Persons of Trinity (sic) shifted the responsibility of the reformation of mankind from one to the other. There was the Father, who, having a certain superiority, in name if not in reality, thought of restoring man to his original state—one should (sic) think it means the savage state, for human progress has been gradual from a lower to a higher stage—but he found his hands tied by the strong manacles of justice. Out of filial reverence the Son offered himself, but when he came into the world, he went away with the empty consolation that the third partner shall come and teach them all truths and guide them into all truth. The third Person, *being only*

*a pigeon* [the italics are ours] found himself unable to undertake the teachings of truths, but thought he had done his duty by teaching the apostles a few dialects, which they were thus able to speak stammeringly." (P. 95.)

The Moslem mind in Islam is still averse to the Gospel, but expresses itself in a new way that bears the trade-mark "made in Germany":

"The heathen idea in slaying an animal was to placate a particular god, who would not be satisfied until the life of an animal was presented as an offering. The practice of offering a beautiful girl annually to the god of the Nile, the waters of which were the principal source of their crops is well known. Even in Christianity we find traces of a similar idea. Man sinned. God will not forgive him until he has offered some sacrifice as an expiation. Now, you need not offer your own sacrifice. Christ, the sinless, the only begotten son of God, was offered as a sacrifice for the sinning humanity—so that whoever believes in this vicarious sacrifice of Christ is saved. Thanks to the Prophet of Islam, the Moslem faith is free from such absurd dogmas as vicarious suffering and atonement. The sacrifice Islam sanctions has absolutely no idea in it of placating an angry Deity."

Although severely critical on the one hand, the attitude of many other educated Moslems, especially in India, Egypt, and Persia, is often sympathetic and eager for the truth. The questions that are put in such magazines as *Epiphany*, published by the Oxford Mission, are abundant proof of a restlessness due to real spiritual hunger. The ethical standards of Christ are openly approved by those who at the same time apply

the acid test of His Gospel teaching to our Western civilization.

To sum up the situation in this new world of Islam, we may say that the whole of Christendom faces the whole Moslem world in the open. The day of clandestine or indirect approach is past. They know and we know that Christianity and Islam face each other as rivals for world dominion. Compromise is as impossible for them as it is for us. A great and effectual door has been opened; a door once barred and bolted is nailed open. But there are many adversaries. And in the present stage of missionary work "a man's foes are they of his own household." The Gospel has not lost its power, however, but is winning Moslem hearts.

The cross of Christ is the missing link in their creed; it is our glory. The life of Christ alone can elevate their moral conceptions; dare we withhold that life from them? The power of Christ alone is able to set them free with the liberty of the sons of God; shall we not proclaim to them this freedom? Their political hopes and pan-Islamic program are ruined. The soil of their hearts has been broken up by the plowshare of God. Now is the time for sowing; tomorrow, the white harvest.

NEW YORK.



# THE REVIEW

## CURRENT THOUGHT AND ACTIVITY

THE CHIEF WORK OF THE CHURCH IS TO DELIVER TO MEN THE Gospel of Jesus Christ their divine Lord and Saviour. That message is not only pre-eminent among all the duties of the church, but it is unique among all messages uttered by man. It is a revealed, an entrusted, proclamation—and the appointed messenger must not lose or change it. We hear that the church is losing her message. If so, that fact may contribute largely toward an explanation of the present condition of things throughout Christendom. Would it not be nearer the fact to say that she lacks messengers of the kind to make the message effective? There are many preachers who, according to human judgment, meet the demands of the situation, but the ministry as a whole has thrown the emphasis too much on other things.

During the closing days of last August and the early days of September there convened in Mürren, Switzerland, a notable conference of church leaders who discussed various questions relating to greater unity among Christians. The leading spirit was Sir Henry S. Lunn, who presided. In his opening address, *An Apostolate and an Evangel*, there occurred this compelling passage upon "the price of apostleship:"

"Inasmuch as an evangel requires an apostle, it must be a fitting prelude to our discussion for me to emphasize the fact that an Apostolate with an Evangel is the supreme need of the age. We have learned by sad experience that you may attempt to eradicate the hatred, the enmities, the sins of the world, by civilization or education, but they always come back. And it is equally quite clear that you may try to expel the Evangel with the pitchfork of modern criticism, but, to quote a recent writer, 'It will always come back, because it alone contains the power

of redemption.' The evangelical faith is immortal, because it ministers to the universal need of the human spirit.

"The greatest of all heresies is antinomianism. That is the supreme danger to-day. In the reaction from the forced discipline of military service, the whole world is passing through a period of lawlessness, and this is especially felt in the religious world. But the full force of the Evangel of Jesus cannot be grasped unless we understand the meaning of the imperatives of the Christian moral law. Without a sense of sinfulness the need of redemption and the meaning of the Evangel cannot be understood. It was because John Wesley had caught a vision of the moral ideal as it glowed in the pages of the *Imitatio Christi* and of Law's 'Serious Call,' that he came to realize his own exceeding sinfulness and his need of salvation. When we are compelled to cry 'God be merciful to us sinners,' then we understand how great is the redemption which Christ brings us. The truths of the Evangel are not the first chapters of the study of religion, but the climax of that study.

"When Jesus was preparing His disciples for the Evangel in all its fulness, and for the Apostolate with which He would entrust them, He laid down certain great principles. The teaching to which they listened for those three momentous years, which gradually sunk into their hearts and consciences, was 'Straight is the gate and narrow is the way;' 'Except a man renounce all that he hath, he cannot be My disciple.' That is how they learned the price of apostleship, the condition of their being commissioned with the Evangel. We can only show our love for Jesus, and that we are His true disciples in the way that He has shewn by 'renouncing ourselves.' We can only prove that we share His love for humanity in the same way. Lawlessness and heresy will not be conquered by ratiocination, but by consecration and conviction. We can be no apostles, we can have no Evangel, unless in the words of St. Bernard of Clairvaux, commenting on the first verse of the Epistle to the Hebrews, our faith 'is not an opinion but a certitude.' As St. Bernard's biographer, Cotter Morrison, says truly, 'Bernard was right, religion is a certitude; an explained or defended religion has half ceased to be one.' Our certitude will depend upon our sacrifice of ourselves. Thus shall we learn the meaning of the Evangel of Calvary.

"No man ever founded an order, or led a religious movement,

who could not say 'I know Whom I have believed.' We must know Christ if we are to be apostles and to have an Evangel.

"The subtlety, ingenuity and earnestness that tries to read new truths into phrases that were meant to convey another and possibly an opposite meaning, creates apologists, not apostles, inside the Church, and outside the Church, contempt, despair, or indifference. That is fatal; apologists are not apostles, truth must come first, and nothing else will grip our hearers.

"The report of the Archbishops' Committee on Evangelistic Work a few years ago said truly, 'if the Church is to preach in this generation an Evangel which will grip, it must come in some real sense as news—news powerful enough to change the whole mental and spiritual outlook.'

"It is this element that has given vitality and saving power to the Evangel of the great leaders in the history of the Christian Church. From close and intimate communion with Christ, they have come forth with a message which was news to the world, because it revealed Christ to the men who listened as they had never heard Him spoken of before. We need the whole power of God, if we are to be apostles, and to convey His Evangel, but God Himself cannot fill with the whole power of His presence, those who do not consciously, as well as truly, apprehend Him."

NO INTERPRETATION OF TRUTH IS ITSELF NECESSARILY TRUE simply because it is old, or false because it is new. Still, beliefs that have stood the test of penetrating minds for centuries are not to be lightly cast aside. Let us have progress in truth, but not mere madness for the new and dazzling. There lately appeared in *Bibliotheca Sacra* a brief symposium on Apologetic in Theology, one paper dealing with The Old Apologetic and one with The New Apologetic. Professor Jesse Johnson of Xenia Seminary, in stating the case for The Old Apologetic, gave this characteristic feature as distinguishing it from the modern type which is more concerned with Christian experience:

"An important characteristic of the old apologetic is its conception of the function of theology, which function is to interpret God, not to interpret Christian experience. He would be a poor God that one could make from experience. If it were meant that our Christian experience may enable us to read our

Bibles better and to enter into a fuller personal knowledge of God, and thus to give a better account of Him to others, we could agree. The theology of the Reformation was in this sense an experimental theology. Luther knew God and the way of salvation better when he experienced the forgiveness of sins. So do we all. Yet Luther was brought to his blessed experience by his new knowledge of God through the Bible. Knowledge of God is first, originally causative, and Christian experience will have genuine worth according as we have true views of God. Then, in its turn, Christian experience will help in knowing God. The Church, therefore, is doing most for Christian experience when she teaches the truth about God. She thus makes a really Christian experience possible, directs and corrects it, and makes it rich."

IF A HALF TRUTH IS SOMETIMES A LIE, IT IS EQUALLY TRUE THAT a half religion may easily produce irreligion. Christianity cannot be taught or practiced by the eclectic method, and remain Christianity. Yet just this is a leading characteristic of much present Christian teaching. The ethical element is emphasized most persuasively, and the distinct and essential teachings that make Christianity a religion, not a mere moral system, are omitted or obscured. The religion of Jesus Christ demands good works, but it is infinitely more than social service propaganda.

If a system of conduct is to appeal successfully and permanently to mankind, it must supply a sufficient motive. Only a full and complete Christianity, covering the questions of responsibility to God, sin, salvation, and spiritual life and growth, carries within itself the motive for a joyous, fruitful, persistent service. Back of the present teaching of many advocates of a mere social Gospel there was once, in their own lives or the lives of their forebears, a vital religious experience. Its momentum is not yet exhausted, but still gives force to this popular near Christianity; but when it is spent, what will vitalize such teaching? The necessity for a whole Christianity is expressed by The Watchman-Examiner in this way:

"There is much preaching of so-called Christian righteousness to-day that leaves essential Christianity almost entirely



out. For example, there is the ringing call of the educated and wealthy man to a life of human service. That is a fundamental Christian conception. It is insisted on in many classical passages of the New Testament, but it is not presented apart from the distinctive Christian motives. When we are exhorted to bear one another's burdens it is that we may 'fulfil the law of Christ.' The twelfth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans is the incomparable picture of the ideal Christian life in a world of human relations, but as every commentator has pointed out, the 'Therefore' of the first verse brings the tremendous motives of our Lord's accomplished redemption to bear upon the fulfilment of these duties. We look almost in vain through these modern discourses that ring the changes on the life of service to find Christian duty connected with distinctive Christian motives.

"This is not accidental. It is symptomatic of an experiment that is being tried on a large scale in the modern world. The quest is to inculcate the Christian ideal of conduct apart from the motives with which in the historic Christian revelation that ideal is connected. The problem is to produce the fruits of Christianity from some other root than the relationship of man and God. Everyone admits that the ideal of the Golden Rule is perfect, but is it possible to inculcate that ideal by entirely different motives from those on which Jesus relied? Is not this just what is being attempted in the effort to regulate the business of worldly men by the Golden Rule? Is it practicable to uphold the Christian morality and let the Christian doctrines go?"

ONE OF OUR MOST COMMON MENTAL FAULTS IS THE LOSS OF THE sense of proportion. Carried to excess in any direction it becomes insanity. The extremist of every kind is the victim of this habit of mind. He cannot comprehend both sides of a question, but vehemently defends that one which first appealed to him, perhaps after very little reflection. A mind of this sort will also emphasize one phase of a question, movement or system of any kind and ignore the rest. In religion we thus have the man who is quite correct in his conduct, but never informs himself on the doctrines of his faith. His opposite is "great on doctrine," but sadly indifferent as to conduct. The real Christian looks after

both, seeking to know what his religion teaches and how to make his life consistent therewith.

The world does not greatly concern itself with Christian doctrine, but it is singularly alert to note inconsistencies in Christian life. Nothing so retards the spread of the Gospel as the failure of members of the church to live according to their profession, and this holds true everywhere, in Christian and in non-Christian nations. In *The Moslem World*, Dr. Talcott Williams places the responsibility for the slow progress of Christianity among Mohammedans on unrealized Christian life, when he says:

"The strongest bar to the conversion of Moslems to Christianity is not the hardness of heart of the Moslems, but the failure of the hearts of Christians to lead Christian lives. Give the world 100 per cent. Christianity, and the world, Moslems included, will become 100 per cent. Christian. While our business, our marriages, divorces and remarriages, our laws, our government, and our politics, the labour of children in Christian lands, the oppression of the poor that have no helper, the unjust distribution of our whole economic system—while these things remain, and are known by all the world, the example of Christianity will leave the world as it is to-day—two-thirds Moslem and non-Christian."

We may appropriately add here a quotation from Bishop Charles H. Brent, writing in *The Churchman*, upon *Discovery of the Lost Christian Ethic*:

"It takes a Chaucer to put the whole matter simply and well in two couplets on the 'poore persoun' (parson) of the town:

"'Christes lore, and His apostles twelve  
He taught, but first He folwed it Himselfe.'

"'This noble ensample to His shepe He gaf  
That first he wroghte and afterwards He taughte.'

"What the poet says of the 'poore persoun' of the town is true in a supreme sense of the poor person of the world, who though He was rich for our sakes became poor that we, through His poverty, might become rich. The Incarnation is not merely an immaculate birth. It is a divine character declaring itself in human experience."

THERE CAN BE LITTLE DOUBT THAT THE GREAT BODY OF PEOPLE are weary of doubt and negation. If a preacher's habit is to present chiefly questions and denials about this or that, he has little usefulness in the pulpit. It might be a good thing if our seminary curricula included a first class course in the psychology of advertising. The professional "ad" writer is very alert upon the factor of suggestion. He is careful that no term or phrase or sentence he uses shall give an unfavorable direction to the reader's thought. Unfortunately many men in the pulpit do not seem to know that there is either a science or an art of suggestion. The Christian Advocate has warned thus against the unfavorable effect of many rhetorical questions:

"Job may have had good reason for asking the question, 'If a man die, shall he live again?' The minister of the Gospel has none. Least of all has he any justification for injecting the question into the mind of the man on the street. It is perfectly true that many are, in the light of modern knowledge, honestly inquiring as to the validity of a faith in life after death. But it is just as true that vast numbers of plain people would never think of raising the question if it were not raised for them.

"Because of these facts, and the universal operation of this law, the same objection can be made to the titles of some religious books and the subjects of certain articles.

"The title, 'Is There a God?' is manifestly unfortunate for any volume that has as its purpose the affirmation of a theistic belief. 'Is Christian Experience an Illusion?' is altogether too provocative of lines of thought which lead to unbelief. And what can be said of the article entitled, 'Can We Still Believe in the Holy Spirit?' except that it is a most reverent and satisfying article, sorely handicapped by a misleading subject."

"Isn't it time to say that certain things are so, rather than continuing to ask, however earnestly, whether or not they are so? Now that the smoke of battle is beginning to clear away and certain moral and spiritual verities are standing forth undestroyed and indestructible, isn't this the opportune moment to proclaim those verities with all the authority of a widened knowledge and deepened experience?"

THE SPEAKERS AND WRITERS WHO ARE HABITUALLY RAISING questions or making denials respecting Christian records and beliefs, with pernicious effect upon their people, are near kindred of those whose idea of a discourse or article is to attack some one or something. The public probably enjoys this sort of utterance better than the other, but it is almost as barren of food for soul or mind. Why not cultivate the sublime art of building up, of exercising the spiritual creative instinct? The United Presbyterian in a recent issue offered this sound advice:

"In these days of doctrinal controversy it is easy to get into the habit of making each sermon a polemic. There are many false theories and false prophets in the land, and occasionally it becomes necessary to do critical and destructive preaching, that is, to point out the false assumptions and indefensible logic of the teachers who are disseminating error. Generally however the errors are best counteracted by holding up in a positive and attractive way the central truths and fine simplicities of the old and tested gospel. The prospect of a fight will attract the crowd. If a man announces that he proposes to annihilate the chief apostle of some particular cult, he is likely to have a curious throng gather to witness the blood-letting. As a rule such preaching does not get us anywhere. Generally nobody is convinced, and each side remains 'of the same opinion still.'

"John Henry Jowett had a great phrase from Emerson that he was frequently quoting and commending to young preachers, and to older ones as well. Here is Emerson's phrase: 'Nerve yourself on the affirmatives.' That is surely one of the wisest sayings of the sage of Concord. Preaching the great affirmatives in constructive fashion, lifting them up in all their own appeal and attractiveness, that is the kind of preaching which gets results. It persuades. It wins. It edifies. It makes character. There is nothing to persuade the mind and renew the character like the constructive and enthusiastic preaching of the great affirmatives. 'The everlasting yea,' to use Carlisle's expression, is packed with spiritual dynamic."

AT INTERVALS FOR ABOUT TWO YEARS THE CHURCHMAN HAS been running articles that have formed a series under the general heading, The American Pulpit. The author's name was not



given, but he wrote under the *nom de plume*, A Dear Hearer. The pulpit traits of distinguished American preachers were discussed with considerable frankness, and naturally this aroused no little criticism and some wrath. There was also much hearty approval. The series recently closed with a couple of papers upon General Impressions, and with the second of these The Churchman editorially revealed the identity of the author, Herbert William Horwill, a distinguished Oxford University man, preacher, and editorial and general contributor to American journals.

In his concluding article he spoke of the tendency of the American pulpit to be rhetorical in style. "Rotund sentences and elaborate periods," he says, "retain in America a vogue that they have long since lost in the English pulpit." Probably there is no single fault of the American pulpit more wearisome to the intelligent hearer than chronic striving after oratory, or its near relative, the habit of continual emphasis. Mr. Horwill has this very sensible thing to say upon sermon preparation:

"One cannot but believe, too, that the pains taken in the composition of these elaborate sermons is applied in the wrong direction. How much better if the preacher has paid less attention to the adornment of his discourse and more to the working out of his theme! There appears too frequently a lack of real mental discipline. The preacher, one feels, does not read the great books or vitalize his intellectual energies by contact with the great thinkers. He spends his time in the search for telling anecdotes or in the construction of eloquent passages rather than in mastering his subject. His elocution may be admirable. What he has to say he may know how to present attractively, but what a pity that it is not better worth saying! I am sure that many preachers would profit immensely by a hard grinding in logic. Their thinking is muddled and inconsecutive. They wander down sidetracks. They announce a text or a subject and then deliver a sermon which would be as germane to almost any other text or any other subject. They illustrate the clever parody of Euclid which asserts that one may speak on any point at any distance from that point."

WORSHIP, REVERENCE SEEM TO HAVE BECOME LARGELY LOST arts in modern Christianity. Most churches are far more concerned over the platform ability of the preacher and the reputation of the choir than they are over the real worship of God, though the term may recur frequently in the service. As to reverence, many people show by their conduct in church that they make no distinction between that place and any other. The churches should make their services true places of worship. As W. J. Dawson says in the *Century*:

"I plead for spirituality, the return of awe, the sense of contact with God and the invisible world we worship. I do not mean by this the pomp of Catholic worship nor the silence of the Quaker meeting house; these are extremes. But I ask, Is there no midway point between these opposite poles? Can not we make a fuller use of beauty in our forms of worship? Can not we make more of silent communion with God and less of public exhortation? Can not we do much more than we do to cultivate the spirit of reverence in worship? There are many immediate directions in which this reform might begin. We can organize ourselves as channels of divine grace rather than spend all our time and urgency in organizing our churches into superb machines for the getting and dispensing of money. We can dethrone the forum and rebuild the altar. We set ourselves against all those cheap and vulgar methods of success which do little more than bring together a casual and capricious audience who in their hearts despise the very methods by which they are attracted. Let us rely on spiritual dynamics, and let us once more write over our churches the ancient words, which are the invocation of all true worship: 'God is in this place. This is none other than the house of God and the gate of heaven.'"

THE CHURCH HAS AN APPALLING NUMBER OF THINGS WITH which to contend. The world, the flesh, and the devil may cover them, so far as a simple formula goes, but these words merely express the sources of the church's troubles, not the innumerable forms in which these prime factors manifest themselves. The very worst type of opposition to the church's life and influence arises within its own fold. If the members of any organization are in harmony among themselves, consistent, and

active in its interests, it can stand an enormous amount of misunderstanding and abuse from the outside. The ancient and insidious order of detractors has its agents in about every human institution and is especially well represented in the church. Rev. Lloyd C. Douglas, writing in the Methodist press, has dealt rather vigorously with several phases of the question, and most preachers will appreciate this quotation:

"It is your opinion—everybody's opinion—that the rising generation lacks the fine regard for the Church which characterized our parents; that the Church as an institution is losing its grip on the lives of the young people now growing up and shortly to become custodians of Christian faith. Well, if this question isn't too infuriatingly blunt, what manner of talk concerning the Church do Jack and Sally hear at their own family dinner table? Is it surprising that they lack interest? Would it not be more surprising if they had any interest, in the face of all the criticisms of the Church that they listen to at home?

"Sometimes one hears large doubts expressed about the divine character of the Church. Many people think and speak of it today as a strictly 'human institution.' Let them not be deceived. No human institution could ever stand up under such punishment, contumely and doleful pessimism as many of our churches have to suffer at the hands of the persons who claim to love them. A human institution has often been known to thrive under opposition from without; but only supernatural guidance could take care of the survival of an institution that receives such bad treatment from within. A college whose alumni regarded it as the members of the average church regard their religious headquarters would close up by the end of this student generation."

MANY A FAITHFUL PASTOR HAS OFTEN GLOOMILY WONDERED whether his work really amounted to anything. It seems to make so little impression on the lives of the community. So with the teacher in the Sunday School. Is it worth while any longer to struggle with that class of troublesome boys or frivolous girls? Such preachers and teachers deserve considerable credit for sticking to their tasks. Often acutely conscious of their own limited abilities and seeing very meager results of their efforts,

they still remain at their posts with a firm faith and a kind of holy pluck.

But there is good evidence that their labors are not in vain. Pastors and teachers both may be encouraged by this testimony to the influence of the Sunday School, given by Supreme Court Justice Lewis L. Fawcett, of New York, who has had eighteen years on the bench:

"In the eighteen years of my experience on the bench more than 4,000 boys less than twenty-one years old have been arraigned before me charged with various degrees of crime. Of this 4,000, only three were members of a Sunday school at the time of the commission of their crimes.

"Even these three exceptional cases were technical in character and devoid of heinousness, so that they are scarcely worth mentioning.

"In 1,092 suspended criminal sentences, only sixty-two of the young men were brought back for violation of the conditions of their paroles. In each suspended sentence case I insisted upon the return of the youth, if he was a Protestant, to a Sunday school; if a Roman Catholic, to attendance at mass, and if a Jew, to attendance at a synagogue or a temple. In each instance I had the earnest co-operation of the minister, the priest or the rabbi, and in each case I saw to it that the young man had a job to go to as soon as he was freed on parole. In virtually all of the suspended sentence cases the reform was quick and, I believe, permanent.

"If we could keep the youth of America in Sunday school during the period of character formation, or at regular attendance upon religious worship, we could close the criminal courts and the jails. There would be no 'raw material' to work on. And what is good for the youth would be equally salutary with adults. The sustained, wholesome, moral atmosphere imparted through habitual attendance upon Sunday school and church will expel criminal impulses.

"Any man not contributing to the support of some church or organized religious work is living on charity—riding on some other man's transportation. If he really desires abatement of crime he should ally himself with those agencies which prevent or abate crime."



ONE OF THE LOSSES THAT COME THROUGH THE DIVISIONS IN THE Christian church is that the truly noble characters and the really fine things that belong to this or that branch are not enjoyed by all to their common profit. Were there no boundary walls, how much wider, for one thing, the range of personal friendships would be? The Congregationalist not long since remarked that the cleavage between Protestants and Catholics kept apart men who, under other conditions, would be friends and co-workers in Christian service. As an illustration of the fine possibilities of such free association and mutual appreciation, it quotes this tribute to the Puritan from an address by Very Rev. Peter J. O'Callaghan, speaking as national president of the Catholic Total Abstinence Union of America at the annual Father Mathew Day celebration in Boston:

"Although most of my priestly life has been spent away from Massachusetts, my heart and soul are still here. I know that the Boston people are capable of an idealism that is fine and noble. I have always been a lover of Massachusetts and think with affection of the companions of my youth, some of whom were not of my faith. It was thought that I loved the Puritans too much, I think I have the Puritan psychology.

"They had the sticktoitiveness and extraordinary courage that made it possible for them to settle here in this most difficult spot, and build up one of the greatest commonwealths the world ever saw, struggling against great odds to lay foundations so deep, in spite of the handicap of misinformation, nevertheless so fair and so just. I treasure the friendship of those who were not of the faith, who had been my college associates, and they hold so big a place in my affection that I cannot help being proud of the fact that I have been a friend of the Puritans."

THE GENERAL STATE OF AFFAIRS—MORAL, SOCIAL, POLITICAL—is not wholly without its favorable reactions. Men are looking toward religion with a new earnestness, as they express the hope that it may provide some escape from the morass into which the world has been slipping. Not only so, but diverse branches of the church of Christ are being brought nearer in sympathy as they see Christianity facing, not only practical atheism, but

severe criticism and even hostility. It is a time when all who name Christ as their divine Saviour need to be on guard against the temptation to point out the faults of other communions than their own. Rather all should rejoice together over every new example of Christian faithfulness in belief or conduct on the part of their fellow Christians of every name.

There has recently arisen a call for Protestants and Catholics to take each other "at their best." A Catholic review, *The Commonweal*, has published a statement by a Catholic layman, William D. Guthrie, that is an instance not only of the appeal to religion as the hope of a stable civilization, but also of frank and generous recognition of the achievements of Christians outside one's own branch of the church:

"American Catholics are profoundly convinced, in which conviction clergy and laity are a unit, that the welfare of the nation, the stability of our constitutional system of government, the continuance of civil and religious freedom, and the lasting happiness of the individual citizen depend upon the code and standards of morality, discipline, self-restraint and temperance taught by religion. And this broad-minded view is not confined to Catholics. The student of history well knows that social order and civilized society have always rested upon religion, that there has never been a civilized nation without religion, that free government has never long endured except in countries where some religious faith has prevailed, and that our own country for four centuries has been an essentially religious country, by which is meant that the great majority of citizens have been believers in God and in some religion. When the Constitution of the United States was established, the Americans were a religious people, and as a whole held firmly to one form or another of Christian faith. As was pointed out by Archbishop Ireland in the Cathedral of St. Paul, in those early days, 'to stay away from religious service on Sunday was to invoke upon oneself serious public criticism regardless of religious affiliation.' It is quite true that the great majority of Americans were then Protestants, but they constituted a religious majority. The Catholics never forget that they owe the blessing of the religious liberty which they now enjoy and which the national Constitution guarantees to a generation that was overwhelmingly Protestant."

IT WOULD BE DIFFICULT TO CONCEIVE OF A RELIGION WITH NO doctrinal development or expression. Doctrine has had so large a place in Christian history that it has had a tendency, with individuals, to overshadow both character and conduct. The old hostility and bitterness over subordinate articles of belief have largely passed away, but there is still too much duplication of effort and of organization, especially among peoples who do not know Protestant history well enough to avoid misjudging it for its lack of unity. The Near East Relief has afforded a lesson in interdenominational co-operation that should be the object of serious thought on the part of Protestant leaders and people both. Rev. John Ralph Voris, Associate General Secretary of the Near East Relief, writes in *The Christian Union Quarterly* on this aspect of that noble work. This passage shows the impression made on the Eastern Orthodox Church by such harmonious activity:

“The passage of time has itself changed the attitude of responsible Eastern Church leaders, but more than the mere passage of years has been the response by all the American churches to the needs of the Eastern peoples during the past eight years. Now the Eastern Church leaders not only find themselves able to believe in the unselfishness of the American churches, but also able to co-operate in a programme.

“This confidence, created so largely through Near East Relief, reaches further still, for the interpretation of the broader American spirit, as shown by both the missionary and the special relief workers during this time of crisis, has done much, not only to break down all suspicion but to create a new faith in other people and a hope for the future. The fact that in Near East Relief there was a *unity* of American churches, so far as Eastern Church leaders could see, was an important element. Scrappy division of territory in these areas, each group working separately would have doomed this confidence forever. Had there been apparent rivalry, or had there been attempts to proselyte, the results would have been immeasurably tragic. There is more for which to be thankful here than appears on the surface. This is what unity will do in one section of the world in a few short years. What would it not accomplish if practiced the world over in missionary endeavours?

"There are many other elements here in line with this thought, which will bear careful scrutiny in the future. Undoubtedly, the Eastern Church officials and more thoughtful laity begin to see in Western Christian expression something that they have not had heretofore that is tremendously valuable. Practical, social Christianity, which, in the name of Christ, organizes relief and reconstruction, builds hospitals overnight, feeds the hungry, clothes the naked, administers to the sick, gives sight to the blind (through the cure of trachoma), breaks the bonds of those that are in bondage, thus interpreted to them in and through a modern and efficient organization in which clergy and laity, men and women, work together to rehabilitate entire populations, cannot but create a desire to know more about the forces lying back of such a programme. These Eastern peoples see some of the Western methods of character building, through play and team work, as well as through study. They observe the spirit of tolerance toward other races and religions. It is true they have seen the same ideas promoted by the educators and the missionaries during the past years, but their eyes have looked with far greater sympathy toward precisely the same thing accomplished in the name of the entire American people and under the pressure of starvation and suffering. One cannot measure this achievement, but, from what I can gather, it has been an inestimable contribution to the Eastern Churches and promises by the appreciation of their leaders a still more valuable potential contribution to future relationship. It is a development of practical Christianity which had been little dreamed of by Eastern Churches."

PROTESTANTISM IN AMERICA HAS LITTLE CONCEPTION OF WHAT the struggling evangelical churches of Europe are going through. Not only are the people suffering from the poverty that followed the War, but as churches they are seeking bravely to carry on with the most insufficient financial resources and face to face with the most aggressive and well supported Roman Catholic activity that the world has seen for some time. The appeals that come to our American Protestant churches must be met if we are not to share the responsibility for a possible very serious reverse for the evangelical cause on the Continent.



The Lutheran, in reviewing some recent literature on the situation, says:

"We just finished reading Dr. Blau's '*Des Abendlandes Rettung oder Untergang?*' (Will Western Civilization Be Saved or Destroyed?) It is a very able criticism of the pessimistic book of Oswald Spangler, of Heidelberg University, entitled, '*Untergang des Abendlandes.*' This book gives voice to the spirit of hopelessness common among serious thinkers in Germany, who look with dread upon the disruption and confusion in Church and State caused by the war. It is a wail of despair, and sees the end of what was once a vigorous and robust Teutonic civilization.

"Dr. Blau, in fine spirit of hopefulness, looks through the dark clouds of Germany's present sad impoverished industrial, political and religious situation, and pins his faith to the only hope of a brighter day in Germany—the same Gospel which remade that nation and others in the days of the Reformation. It is not an industrial problem, or a political problem, or a social problem, or a cultural problem that must be solved in Western Europe; but a *religious* problem. There must be a re-birth of religion if western civilization is to be prevented from foundering on the rocks. Whatever the menace of racial hatreds and jealousies as they exist in Europe may be, Germany must rise from her ashes and become the bulwark of evangelical Christianity if Romanism and Communism are to be prevented from gaining the mastery in Western and Central Europe. A re-birth of the Reformation faith and spirit, bringing a message and speaking a language which men of the present can understand, is what Europe needs today.

"It is an earnest voice and a hopeful voice that speaks in this booklet. Dr. George Stewart gives an equally impressive survey of conditions in 'The Church of Christ in Europe.' He speaks of eight problems which Protestant congregations in Europe must face—Disestablishment, Demolition of Churches and Institutions, Government and Social Opposition, Extreme Poverty of the Professional and Middle Classes, which are the main support of religion, Aggressiveness of a United World Roman Catholicism, which has opened in five years 700 institutions in place of almost as many Protestant institutions which were obliged to close doors for lack of funds, Shattered Missionary Work with a Weakened Home Base, Dearth of Theological

Seminary Facilities, and a Heart-breaking Lack of Pastors to Minister to a People in Dire Need of the Gospel."

THE TERM SCIENCE HAS ACQUIRED A SORT OF INTELLECTUAL halo, as though it designated a region of thought so mysterious and so unapproachable that only a few favored initiates are found therein. Now scientific thinking differs not at all in kind from other thinking. It is simply more accurate, more systematic, and more impersonal than the thought we usually gave to our daily affairs, and it often operates in fields largely unfamiliar to the layman.

Not to take up its psychological aspect, but considering it simply from the logical side, thinking consists in securing and interpreting data. When the data are gathered with the utmost precision and completeness, and are interpreted by unbiased, logical thinking, in order to come at their full and exact collective meaning, we have true scientific thinking, whether applied to a study of the stellar universe or to the best place to spend a vacation. Such thinking is of course objective, that is, it is calm, impersonal judgment of facts; it is not determined by the subjective elements of emotion, imagination, self-consciousness. An editorial in *The Continent* expresses it in this way:

"Truth, which is the correspondence of our thoughts with things, the harmony of our minds with reality, is the foundation of all our thinking and acting, the bond of our social life, the common ground on which we walk. In so far as we fail to find facts and fit our subjective beliefs into objective things, we are out of gear with reality and are living in a false world. And in so far as we refuse or fail to see facts as they are, but shape and pervert them to fit our own preconceived views or personal prejudices and interests, we are infiltrating falsity into our very souls and are undermining our whole life."

A writer in the Centennial Volume of Yale Divinity School, Education for Christian Service, has put much the same idea in these words:

"There is nothing esoteric about scientific method; it is

simply logical thinking under the guidance of experience. It is modelled upon common sense, and differs from ordinary, haphazard thinking in being more careful and orderly and expert, and consequently more successful. The scientist is simply one who is an expert observer and thinker in some special field or fields of investigation. Scientific technique is a perfectly transparent device or set of devices for economizing thought and utilizing experience."

THE ATTEMPTS TO EXPLAIN AWAY THE INTELLIGENT AND PURPOSEFUL Creator are failing in science just as they failed in the old-fashioned atheism. Science is far more willing than formerly to let the facts it discovers offer their own evidence, regardless of preconceptions held by scientists. A review of what has taken place in the scientific world, even within the past half-century, distinctly shows this trend. At the recent meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, held in Toronto, Professor William McDougall of Harvard read an address which summarized, in these statements, the change of views in his own lifetime:

"Thirty to forty years ago, when I began to study science, considerable moral courage would have been required to insist upon the purposive nature of man. For at that time the great wave of scientific materialism was still but little past its climax. It was the day of Spencer and Huxley, of Clifford and Tyndall, of Lange and Weismann, of Verworn and Bain. The world and all the living things in it were presented to us with so much prestige and confidence as one vast system of mechanistic determination that one seemed to be placed before two acutely opposed alternatives: on the one hand, science and universal mechanism; on the other hand, humanism, religion, mysticism and superstition.

"But today how different is the situation. Even at the date I speak of, a few great psychists warned us against regarding the principles of physical science as adequate to the interpretation of human life. And today these few voices have swelled to a chorus which even the deafest biologist can hardly ignore. Einstein and Eddington and Soddy and a score of others repeat the warnings of Maxwell and Kelvin and Poynting and Rayleigh. And the physical universe of eternal hard

atoms and universal elastic ether, the realm of pure mechanics, has become a welter of entities and activities which change in development and disappear like the figures of the kaleidoscope. The psychologist who would believe in the efficiency of human effort no longer needs to fling himself in vain against the problem, How can mind deflect an atom from its predetermined course? For the atoms are gone: matter has resolved itself into energy, and what energy is no man can tell, beyond saying it is the possibility of change, of further evolution.

"In psychology the mechanistic confidence of the 19th century is fading away as the complexity of the living organism is more fully realized, as its powers of compensation, self-regulation, reproduction and repair are more fully explored.

"In general biology the mechanistic neo-Darwinism is bankrupt before the problems of evolution, the origin of variations and mutations, the differentiation and specialization of instincts, the increasing role of intelligence adaption, the predominance of mind in the later stages of the evolutionary process, the indications of purposive striving at even the lowest levels, the combination of marvelous persistency of type with indefinite plasticity which pervades the realm of life and which finds its only analogue in the steadfast purposive adaptive striving of a resolute personality."

IT HAS BEEN REMARKED FREQUENTLY OF LATE THAT SCIENCE is becoming more cautious in asserting conclusions. The temper of the individual scientist is another matter, governed by the circumstances in each case. But the scientific world at large is no doubt much less disposed than formerly to regard its most recent discoveries in any field as the conclusion of the whole matter. The pronouncement of a universal negative has so often proved the unwisdom of its author that scientists in general are becoming more cautious. A widely used work on physics years ago illustrated this fact when it announced that, while an electric motor had actually been constructed, electricity would never become a practical motive power. The wise man will not be quick to utter such presumptive finalities. In his recent volume, *Science and Life*, Professor R. A. Millikan, the noted physicist, has demonstrated the folly of premature conclusions by this



sketch of certain discoveries in his own time, which is quoted by a reviewer of his book:

“When I started my graduate work in 1893, so sure were we of the physical foundations of the world, with its seventy-odd unchangeable, indestructible elements, its well-formulated laws of matter-physics and its equally firmly established laws of ether-physics—ethereal and material phenomena being sharply and definitely differentiable—and the principles of the conservation of energy, the conservation of mass, and the conservation of momentum acting as nature’s policemen to keep the universe running eternally within the law, that it was then being frequently said, often by the ablest physicists, that it was probable that all the great discoveries in physics had already been made and that future progress was likely to arise only by increasing the refinement of our measurements. Then came, only two years thereafter, the capital discovery of X-rays, an entirely new phenomenon, having no relation whatever to refinements of measurement. And two years later came radio-activity, which has now completely exploded the notion of the eternal character of the atom and revealed a world in which many, if not all, of the so-called elements are continually undergoing change, spontaneously shooting off projectiles with stupendous speeds, speeds far beyond those which it had ever been thought possible that matter in any form could attain. And then three years later came the beginning of the quantum theory, which has shown us unmistakably (so it appears) that in the domain in which electrons live even the electro-magnetic laws no longer hold. And then a few years later, through Einstein’s insight or speculations, as you prefer, mass and energy became interconvertible terms, and now we are all agreed that our former sharp distinctions between material, electrical and ethereal phenomena have got to be abandoned.”

THE SUPPOSED CONFLICT BETWEEN RELIGION AND SCIENCE WILL be ended only when each realizes the limitations of its own principles. An attempt to perform a chemical analysis according to the Bible would be no more absurd than is an attempt to explain man’s spiritual experience by the mechanistic theory of the universe.

Dr. E. Y. Mullins’ book, *Christianity at the Cross Roads*,

called forth a letter from a scientist to the author objecting that he left science and religion in conflict. Dr. Mullins has replied in a very clear article in *The Watchman-Examiner*, in which he explains that his position on this point was wholly misunderstood. He first reminds us that "science explains an event by the law of continuity or causality," and cites Newton's discovery of the law of gravitation by way of illustration, showing how absurd it would have been to seek to account for the apple's fall by a religious explanation. Then Dr. Mullins proceeds:

"Next consider an event in the realm of religion, say the conversion of the persecutor Saul and his sudden transformation into the flaming Apostle of Christianity. Apply the law of physical continuity, and you are hopelessly mired in your reasoning. Even psychology in the form known as Behaviorism, which sees nothing but nervous excitements and reactions in all human conduct, cannot touch the causes operating in Paul's conversion. The antecedents are in direct conflict with the consequents. What followed was in palpable contradiction with what preceded. The traits of the apostle contradicted in most vital ways the traits of the persecutor. Before the event Saul tried to suppress the gospel in every creature. Afterwards as the Apostle Paul he sought to preach the gospel to every creature. Here then is a spiritual event. Atoms, electrons, physical forces are out of the question. Here are a changed will, a changed mind, a changed conscience, a changed heart. We are in the realm of personality. This religious event calls for a religious explanation. The record says Saul met Christ on the Damascus road, that God spoke to him through the Glorified Christ. Paul himself testifies that God in Christ entered his life in a new way. He declares that it was the divine power that raised Christ from the dead which had entered his life and filled it with the new spiritual energy.

"Here then we have religious explanation where it alone will explain. It is not based upon a relation between atoms and energy, between physical antecedents and consequents, between kinetic energy and its manifestations, between neurones and psychoses, or anything else of a purely physical or psychic kind. It is outside the chain of physical causes. God meets a man. A human will is changed by the divine will.

A human personality is redeemed from sin and its power by a divine energy. It is a religious event. The method of explanation must conform to the fact to be explained. The conclusion is that science explains physical events by the principle of causality. Religion explains spiritual events by the principle of personality. The spiritual realm of will, of conscience, of love, of faith, of hope, of righteousness is as real as rocks and hills and planets and suns. It is the realm of freedom, of salvation, of fellowship between God and man."

SCIENCE BECOMING MORE HUMBLE, MORE REVERENT, EVEN almost spiritual; the church growing more intellectual, more materialistic, more prone to doubt—these we are told are among the changes of this unsettled age. To put it otherwise, while modern theology is unwilling to accept what it cannot prove on positive evidence or demonstrate on rational principles, science is admitting that, on the trail toward the ultimate, there is a point beyond which it cannot pass. Contributing to *The Christian Century*, upon *The Spirituality of Science*, J. W. Whillans has made this comparison:

"Vibration is the key word of the new knowledge. Light, sound, and heat do not come to us in unbroken streams, but in waves or vibrations, and a difference in the number of vibrations per second gives us the difference in our sensations. A difference in the vibrations of light gives us the different colors, as a difference in the vibrations of sound gives us the different notes in music. And now science is telling us that the atom, the foundation of all material things, is a rapid motion or vibration of that invisible, immaterial force, electrical energy, the nature of which is still a mystery.

"Christianity has always taught that the material world is but a form—real as such, but not real in the sense that it is eternal. 'The world passeth away, and the lust thereof: but he that doeth the will of God abideth forever.' Ultimate reality is spiritual, according to Christianity, and to this truth the church has held, despite crass materialism, the opposition of science falsely so-called, and its own lapses from its true spiritual mission in the world. Now comes science with its

modern view of the atom and likewise reduces the solid material world in its essence to immateriality and invisibility.

"Today when science is pointing to a spiritual explanation of material things, and when the reality of the unseen world is dawning upon men in a new way, our religion has its multiplied organizations that cater to the physical needs of men, in entertainment, physical culture, and the food that perishes, so that the church is in danger of surrendering to materialism at the very moment of her triumph. The church can only live as she proclaims spiritual truth, and it is only thus that she deserves to live. Surely this is the time for the church to turn from her materialism, lest she find science holding a more spiritual conception of the world than she holds herself, and to emphasize in a new way the greatness and grandeur of her spiritual mission and message."

THE TECHNICAL MAN, HE OF MATHEMATICAL TABLES AND LABORATORY, has rather scant respect for the student of the classics, that is, for a liberal education. Our marvelous material development has opened an attractive and profitable field for the specialist in any physical science, but neither his education nor his work contributes much to his development as a man, to his appreciation of spiritual values, to his vision of things beyond the limits of his vocation.

Mr. Philip Cabot, whose account of his own spiritual awakening attracted some attention not long ago, has, in *The World's Work*, devoted a brief paper to the problems of leadership. He reviews the marvelous development of technical training and its advantages over the old inadequate knowledge and uncertain methods, but he points out the singular fact that, with the schools turning out thousands of men of the highest vocational equipment, the demand for real leaders far exceeds the supply. These excerpts show Mr. Cabot's view of the difficulty and the way to meet it, and they deserve the attention of others than those directly concerned with industrial problems:

"Our great industrial leaders who complain that they cannot get enough propelling men are more vocal in criticism than in constructive suggestion, but in this problem of educating



leaders or producing more 'heads' and fewer 'hands' some points at least are clear.

"It is clear, for example, that there is an urgent and steady demand for scientifically trained men such as our technical schools are now producing; and, further, that the output now coming into the market is of excellent quality.

"Our system which produces these men, though of very recent design, has been a wonderful success. The technical schools have done a great public service, but they have not really attempted to turn out men characterized by boldness, imagination, and a deep religious faith. The training of our scientific schools puts the emphasis on caution and highly developed powers of reasoning, which lead men to scepticism and not to faith and make them careful rather than courageous.

"Your successful system for training leaders must take another road. In such men you must develop poetry, imaginative boldness, the power of vivid conception, and enthusiasm. You must teach them salesmanship and not science, and before all, through all, above all, must be the spirit of service, human sympathy, and a burning religious faith.

"These points, I believe, will meet with general assent: that the method and the results of the training in our scientific schools are remarkably successful in doing what they have undertaken; that they do not profess to train men in those qualities of leadership which I have tried to define; and that more leaders are needed if our industrial system is to survive. The magnitude and tyrannical power of that system has now reached a point (sometimes referred to as the dominion of machines) which has enslaved and will destroy us if man does not regain the upper hand."

"The tendency to overdevelop technique in our present educational method is the normal swinging of the pendulum of progress away from a very real danger. The engineer of the old school never achieved sufficient grasp of fact; he was relatively loose minded and therefore vague and dangerous. The reaction from this has developed the slave of the formula, as well as the lamp, whose essential weakness lies in the assumptions that there are no other forms of fact, that all facts are of the mathematical sort, and that there are no spiritual facts. But I bid you observe that God and the soul are the hardest and most essential facts in the universe. They cannot be reduced to

a formula and so the engineers disregard them, with the result that the men have crystalized into dangerous automatons."

"My faith in God and my hope for man force me to conclude that in the eternal race of science with the soul, the soul will win; and therefore, if you would be upon the winning side, educate the spirit before the mind."

EXPERIENCE IS THE GREAT TEACHER, AND THERE IS NO EXPERIENCE like that of human nature. In the study of history one is impressed by the fact that men are not greatly moved by abstract ideas, for these are too much like disembodied spirits, incapable of normal human contacts. To become effective they must somehow become incarnate in the instincts, the feelings, the aspirations of men. Similarly the most vital and moving expressions upon any principle or achievement are not found among cold arguments and methodical records, but in those utterances of life itself. Woodrow Wilson seems to have had this in mind when he wrote, in 1895, this which has recently been quoted:

"There is more of a nation's politics to be got out of its poetry than out of all its systematic writers upon public affairs and constitutions. Epics are better mirrors of manners than chronicles; dramas oftentimes let you into the secrets of statutes; orations stirred by a deep energy of emotion or resolution, passionate pamphlets that survive their mission because of the direct action of their style along permanent lines of thought, contain more history than parliamentary journals. It is not knowledge that moves the world, but ideals, convictions, the opinions or fancies that have been held or followed; and whoever studies humanity ought to study it alive, practice the vivisection of reading literature, and acquaint himself with something more than anatomies which are no longer in use by spirits."

ARE THE LURE OF GAIN AND THE FEAR OF LOSS THE TWIN motives that determine the daily life of most people? Much of the advice to the young and most of the stories of successful lives in our current periodicals would indicate an affirmative answer, and the advertising pages greatly strengthen the impression made by the reading matter. It is therefore refreshing to find a secular journal, Wallace's Farmer, published by

the late Secretary of Agriculture, rebuking this continual emphasis upon man's cupidity. From an editorial are taken these vigorous words:

"The profit motive, which is relied upon to make our complex industrial organization work, in the end is bound to give us no more than the disaster unregulated selfishness always brings. Unfortunately, most of our economists and our writers on business affairs talk the most unmitigated nonsense on this point. They insist that unless the hope of inordinate profits is held out, no one will work efficiently."

"The sort of world we all want is one in which every one has the simple basic material needs satisfied, has the opportunity to satisfy intellectual and spiritual hunger, and has the joy of doing the kind of work he likes best to do. And the first step in getting that sort of world is to realize that to hold out the promise of great wealth to the man who works hard, or perhaps merely cheats shrewdly, is not the way to make progress. The profit motive, far from being the automatic regulator of our affairs to the best interests of all, is the thing that gets our civilization into its wars, its graft cases, its oil scandals, its chicanery."

AS INDUSTRIALISM DEVELOPS IN THE ORIENT IT IS PRESENTING all the problems of the exploitation of human beings. The Christian enlightenment of the West has exercised a greater check upon the oppression of the toilers than would seem to be true of the Far East, to judge by the accounts that reach us of the treatment of employees, women and children especially. Yet from China comes a description of one concern's methods which might be taken by many companies here at home as a model. Mr. and Mrs. Frank Gaylord Cook have written this account of their visit to the Commercial Press of Shanghai:

"This was started by Christian Chinese and has always been run on Christian principles, though a paying business enterprise. About 500 out of 3000 employes are professing Christians. There is a nine-hour day, no Sunday work, a grant of two months' pay for mothers at the time their babies are born, a nursery where mothers can bring their babies and go out and nurse them, a primary school, a dispensary, an at-

tractive garden and a club building which we did not see. There are bonuses and a savings department and retiring grants, and about everything up-to-date except shop committees or anything in the least approaching shop representation on the management. The capital is \$5,000,000 and there is not a foreigner connected with the concern."

IT IS VERY DIFFICULT FOR A WESTERNER TO UNDERSTAND THE complicated Chinese situation. Even if he finds a seemingly clear, straightforward account he cannot feel altogether sure it is not the product of some propagandist scheme to influence the minds of foreigners. However, with respect to one of the outstanding leaders of the past few months, Gen. Feng Yu-hsiang, reports pretty generally agree that he is a high-minded Christian. As he is not unlikely to be prominent in Chinese affairs in the future, this brief statement respecting his character, as given by a correspondent of the *Observer*, London, will be of interest:

"That Feng is an honest man and a sincere Christian is, I think, beyond question. That he enjoys the confidence and loyalty of his officers and men, in a degree to which there is no parallel in China to-day, is also beyond doubt. And that he is trusted and admired by his countrymen at large is proved by the fact that in a list of the Twelve Greatest Living Chinese, chosen by vote in a competition conducted by the *Weekly Review* of Shanghai, General Feng was near the top of the list. Three others of the twelve, it is interesting to note, were, like Feng himself, members of the Chinese Christian Church.

"Impressed first, in 1900, by the 'Christian devotion and sweetness of spirit' shown by an American lady missionary murdered in the Boxer Rising, he decided definitely to become a Christian in 1913. Being a man of great practical common-sense, he has made his religion an everyday business, and has thrown into his military duties, both in peace and war, the principles which he understood to be Christian. His troops have been as welcome in any province where they have been stationed as any others were unwelcome. Every officer and man under his command has had the chance of a good elementary education and the opportunity of learning a trade which he might practice on returning to civil life."



IF WE ARE GOING TO KEEP UP WITH THIS AGE WE MUST LEARN to read. Of course we cannot start with the alphabet and go through the whole process again, as we did when children. The idea is, that we must develop some system that will enable us to maintain a fair degree of intelligence respecting the significance of contemporary printed matter, both book and periodical. The old slow, laborious reading soon leaves one hopelessly behind. Omitting what is worthless, what is of such a technical character that we general readers are not concerned with it, and all other matter that very properly need not interest us, we still face a mountain of rich ore that is worth mining. Yet we know we cannot handle it all. More and more the reading of well-informed people must be selective. The librarian of the St. Louis Public Library has, in the Methodist press, made several suggestions that are worth passing on:

"All reading is, or should be, an adventure. When the reader sets out, he does not know exactly what he is going to meet. Like the explorer, who may find a mountain, or a river, or bring up at the brink of a precipice, who may encounter climates that are friendly or hostile, the reader may at any time run across an idea that will fill him with joy, or sadness, or contempt—may find himself in difficulties, or come upon unexpected beauties. It is this that makes reading so fascinating. A dip into a book is a voyage among ideas. No one is quite content with his own; he likes to pick up those of others where he can find them; he enjoys combining them, joining them in chains, assembling them in groups. It is thus that civilization makes progress.

"The only difference between the non-reader and the reader is that the former is content with ideas that he can find close at hand, by talking with friends—on the street, in a chance crowd—while the reader loves to get his ideas across vast intervals of space and time—from a writer of a thousand years ago or three thousand miles away. We have mails, telegraphs and the radio to bridge distance, but it is only the book that can bridge time also.

"The man who realizes that reading is an adventure among other people's ideas, and who finds such adventure thrilling and enthralling, need never lack time for it. The geographical ex-

plorer must carry out his quest continuously; he can not see Peru on Monday and eat his dinner at home on Tuesday. Still less can he look upon the mountains of Tibet, the tundras of Alaska and the skyscrapers of New York, all in one and the same hour. But the adventurer in reading can do all this and more. He can follow out his quest for ten minutes this morning and, then, abandoning it for the time, take it up this evening just where he left off. He can explore philosophy this morning, salesmanship this afternoon, and spend the evening with Dickens in London or with Sabatini on a pirate ship. The joys of reading are like Cleopatra as Shakespeare describes her—'Age can not wither them, nor custom stale their infinite variety.'

"One of the explorer's most disagreeable experiences is to get into uninteresting country—a vast extent of flat sand, or marsh, or interminable forest. It takes him quite as long to get out as to get in. Sometimes he does not get out at all, but is engulfed by a quicksand or dies of thirst in the desert. The adventurous reader is never troubled thus. When his book gets boresome, he is rid of it at once by dropping it, or he can skip the tiresome part. Let us hope that a misleading conscience does not stand in his way. A sensible writer says, 'The art of reading is the art of judicious skipping.' A relative of mine with one of these objectionable literary consciences will stick to a boresome book for days, loudly condemning and complaining the while. 'But if it is so poor, why do you read it? Why not stop right there?' 'Oh, I can't do that. I've begun it, and I must keep on to the end; father taught us, when we were young, always to finish what we had begun.' Father's advice was good, in its proper application; but applied to a stupid book, it was as wrong as if he had given it to a strayed explorer. People on the wrong track should stop at once and get on a better one; and for the reader this is so easy!"

## BOOKS

THE MODERN USE OF THE BIBLE<sup>1</sup>

In this course of Yale lectures Dr. Fosdick devotes his attention to the intellectual perplexities of those moderns who are disturbed by the new knowledge of science and Biblical criticism. The problems discussed arise from the necessity of using the "Old Book in the New Age." The natural reaction to such a situation is to discard the "Old Book" as out of date. But the Christian cannot do this. So some way must be found by which the "Old Book" can still be used in the "New Age" without intellectual discomfort. It is to this task of adjustment that Dr. Fosdick devotes this series of lectures. He begins by calling our attention to the fact that we are not the first generation to face this same problem:

"Ours is not the first modern age. . . . Therefore, ours is not the first occasion in history when folk who venerated and believed in a sacred book have been distressed and puzzled because so many things in it seemed unfitted to their modern world." (P. 65.)

The ancient solution used to be the resort to allegory, but our author informs us that this is no longer available for the modern, so that a new one must be secured. The one which Dr. Fosdick uses is built up around the theory that there are two quite distinct religious elements in the Bible. One is intellectual; the other is psychological. The psychological element is rooted in first-hand religious experience; the intellectual element is rooted in the effort to interpret this experience in a mental category. The religious experience is by its nature permanent; the interpretation is by nature temporary. This distinction leads us into the heart of the author's method of dealing with modern perplexities. He says:

---

<sup>1</sup>The Modern Use of the Bible. By Harry Emerson Fosdick, Professor of Practical Theology, Union Theological Seminary, New York. Being the Lyman Beecher Lectures on Preaching, at Yale, 1924. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1924. Pp. 291.

"Some men, to be sure, impatient with the incredible formula, throw over all religion and go out from it crying like Clifford, 'The Great Companion is dead,' but other souls cannot do that; religion means too much to them" (p. 185 f.).

It is at this point that the author offers another alternative. He says: "The way out leads inevitably through liberalism" (p. 185). Speaking of Liberals, he continues:

"They discover that their religion does not consist in the formula but in the experience of which the formula was a transient phrasing. They become liberals by retreating from the formula into the experience behind it, by translating the formula back into the life out of which it came." (P. 186.)

This is a splendid description of the nature of Liberalism and the psychological process by which it functions. It can be reduced to two propositions: First, pick out the abiding experience as you would the kernel of a nut; then throw away the mental category which encased it as the useless shell. Second, reproduce this abiding experience in your own religious life. Then you are in possession of "all that matters." This reproduced experience you are at liberty to rephrase in any mental category which is acceptable to your age's way of thinking. To demonstrate the ease with which this principle can be applied, Dr. Fosdick selects ten of the most disturbing Biblical categories, and shows how he would apply it in each case. The categories discussed are: Belief in the Inspiration of the Bible, Belief in the Resurrection of the Body, Belief in the Second Coming of Christ, Belief in Demons, Belief in Angels, Belief in Miracles, Belief in the Divinity of Jesus, Belief in the Trinity, Belief in Jesus as Messiah, Belief in Jesus as the Son of God.

The limitations of space force us to be content with three examples of this demonstration: Belief in Miracles, Belief in Jesus as Messiah, Belief in Jesus as the Son of God.

First, Belief in Miracles. Dr. Fosdick's first question is:

"What, then, was the abiding conviction which our fore-



fathers at their best were expressing when they thought and talked in terms of miracles?" (P. 157.)

His answer is:

"They were believing in the providence of God and in his immediate presence and activity in his world" (*ibid*).

Having thus separated the kernel of truth, the abiding experience, from its shell, the miracle category, all trouble with the miraculous automatically vanishes. For the problem has been uprooted from its original objective and historical soil and transplanted in the subjective realm of religious experience. And the only problem left is a present-day one. It is thus stated:

"Belief in miracles, therefore, is not first of all an historical matter; it is a contemporary challenge. To learn anew the power of prayer, to release through our lives a superhuman Spirit into human affairs, to do things which cannot be done, until men find it easy to believe in God because of the evident marvels of his presence in us and through us—this is what it really means to believe in miracle." (P. 166.)

Take a second category, Belief in Jesus as Messiah. We read:

"For Messiahship was simply the Hebrew category of function and purpose; it was a way of saying that God had specially anointed one to mediate his sovereignty over all mankind" (p. 234).

The Messianic category came to be applied to Jesus thus:

"Then Jesus came. He came with his supreme personality, and he had to be interpreted. Men did not have time to ask whether their thought-forms were adequate for the task. . . . Men used the intellectual forms of thought with which they were equipped." (P. 216 f.)

"The Jewish Christians naturally used 'Messiah' " (p. 213).

What is the modern Gentile Christian to do with this Jewish category? Well, he also is face to face with the same towering and tremendous character. How shall he explain the Jesus of the New Testament and the Jesus of history? Great caution

must be used at this point, lest complications arise. So Dr. Fosdick makes this suggestion:

"If we ask who Jesus *is*, we may be unsure, we may share our generation's doubts and uncertainties. Change the inquiry, therefore; what has Jesus done? what changes has he wrought? what contributions has he made to life?" (P. 221 f.)

This simple shift of the question from "who" to "what" places the Liberal's feet upon solid intellectual ground. And he continues:

"Such matters belong to history. They can be stated. And, as we state them, the recurring theme of our argument will be: Jesus must have been the kind of person who could do what he has done." (P. 222.)

This last deduction seems a perfectly safe and modest claim to defend. The next question to be settled is: What contributions has Jesus made to life? Under six general extra-Biblical statements the author now summarizes what he believes to be a fair estimate of Jesus' contribution to life. When he has finished he asks:

"These things at the very least the Master has done for men, and he must have been the kind of person who could do them. And if, facing these facts, one says that Jesus was the divinely appointed agent of God's kingdom in the earth, is that too much to say? Is it not the most obvious and simple thing that we could say?" (P. 233 f.)

As to the third category, the Belief in Jesus as the Son of God, the belief arose in this fashion:

"The disciples felt in him something not of this world. They were sure about his manhood, but it was manhood suffused and irradiated. It subdued them, awed them, fascinated, and mastered them. . . . They did not start by believing in opinions about him, doctrines concerning him; they started by believing in him. The objective of their faith was not a theory; it was his personality, his life." (P. 258.)

So here again we find:

"The doctrine of the divinity of Jesus was thus the expres-

sion in current terms of the central experience of the Christian life—finding God in Christ. The divinity of Jesus is not something first of all to be treated as a formula; it is something first of all to be vitally discovered, experienced, and lived upon.” (P. 261.)

This fact sets the task for the Liberal around this proposition:

“This Gospel of God revealed in Christ, released from literal bondage to old categories and set free to do its work in modern terms of thought and speech, ought to be the central affirmation of our preaching. . . . We are wrong when we make belief in the divinity of Jesus a technical, philosophical affair.” (*Ibid.*)

How is this Gospel of God, revealed in Christ, to be freed from literal bondage to old categories, and set free to do its work in modern terms of thought and speech? To this problem the author now turns his attention. He informs us that the Logos category was adopted because it bridged the chasm which separated the divine from the human in ancient Greek thought. As long as that chasm remained in existence, the Logos category was useful. Today no such chasm between the divine and human exists. The doctrine of the immanence of God implies His immediate presence in us, in our lives, in society, and in the material universe. This doctrine explains for us the Jesus of the Gospels in terms which we can understand. It can all be gathered up in this clause, “it was God in him who created his quality” (p. 270). The significance of this truth is thus expressed:

“Such an approach to the divinity of Jesus makes him as he is in the New Testament, not only unique but imitable, keeps him not only our Lord but our brother” (p. 269).

At first thought the idea of imitating Jesus staggers the Liberal as well as the Conservative. This challenge leaves all in despair. The author asks:

“If he be only a good man, he is an isolated phenomenon, like Shakspeare or Napoleon in other realms. How can we,

pulling on our own bootstraps, set out to lift ourselves by imitation to the likeness of such?" (P. 270.)

But, out of the doctrine of the immanence of God the modern draws his inspiration and his hope. It is thus stated:

"But if Jesus is divine and if divinity hedges us all about like the vital forces which in winter wait underneath the frozen ground until the spring comes, that is a gospel! Then the incarnation in Christ is the prophecy and hope of God's indwelling in every one of us." (P. 270 f.)

It is out of this new interpretation of the divinity of Jesus in terms of our common human divinity that the author arrives at this most unexpected discovery:

"Let us say it abruptly: *it is not so much the humanity of Jesus that makes him imitable as it is his divinity*" (p. 270).

This statement is so revolutionary that the writer does not try to connect it logically with his other thought. At first it is calculated to astonish and puzzle his Liberal followers. But when its full relation to the doctrine of the immanence of God is appreciated, all difficulty vanishes.

With these three decoded categories before us, we are in a position to estimate the value of the method which they illustrate. That it is a popular idea needs no confirmation. As presented by Dr. Fosdick it has captured the imagination of the educated youth of our Eastern colleges, as well as older moderns, in a way that no other idea has approached. It is also the easiest way known to scholarship by which the necessary adjustment between the old and the new can be effected. This fact also adds to its immediate popularity. If these were the only criticisms to be made of this method of adjustment, our review would end here.

Such a complete and radical break with the past inevitably places heavy responsibilities upon those who accept the religious freedom which it offers. Dr. Fosdick is keenly alive to some of these perils. In the midst of his course of lectures, he pauses to throw in one on *The Perils of the New Position*. Four



of these, he calls to the attention of liberal Christians: Irreverence, sentimentality, obscure and chaotic thinking, and ethical disloyalty to Jesus. These perils the author fearlessly and adequately discusses.

There is one peril, however, which seems to have escaped his notice. It is the peril of subjectivism. It is possible for Liberals to protect themselves against the four perils mentioned by Dr. Fosdick, but no one who uses his method, can escape from the peril of subjectivism. For it is the heart of his theory.

As has been seen, the first step in the application of this theory is to uproot the problem from its original objective and historical soil and transplant it in the subjective realm of symbolism. The habitual application of this principle inevitably tends to minimize the value of the historical and objective, and to magnify out of all proportion to their true importance the subjective and the symbolic. Belief in miracles, instead of being a historical matter, becomes a challenge in religious experience. Belief in the Messiahship of Jesus, instead of being a historical question, becomes also a problem in religious experience. Belief in the divinity of Jesus becomes, not a philosophical question, but one of religious experience. And so with all of the ten subjects discussed. This shift involves these weaknesses:

1. The historical problem, which is always so lightly set aside, cannot be permanently ignored. Eventually every historical question must be honestly faced and disposed of upon the basis of historical evidence. No scheme which indiscriminately rejects the true with the false can hope to win finally intelligent acceptance. Take for example the question of Jesus' own Messianic consciousness, and the consequence of His having appropriated this Messianic category to Himself. All the consideration which is given to this tremendously important and unsettled question is contained in this passage:

"Scholars differ as to whether, in spite of words ascribed to him, Jesus held this thought of himself or even called himself Messiah at all" (p. 214).

The simple fact that scholars differ is no valid ground for dismissing the whole momentous question as though it were of no importance. The scientific historic method recognizes that, when scholars differ, some one must be right, and some one wrong. The question is not settled until it has been determined who is right. This is true of every one of the historic questions which is dismissed without discussion.

2. The philosophical fallacy at the root of this method lies in the assumption that present-day religious experience is adequate to furnish sufficient ground for the correct interpretation of all truth, past as well as present. Now, modern epistemology warns us that immediate experience and immediate experience interpreted are very precarious premises from which to draw universal conclusions. These individual and group deductions need to be checked up by the universal, by the historical, by the personal testimony of those who were eye-witnesses of the events under consideration, and also by logical deductions from correct premises. All of these counter-checks Dr. Fosdick completely ignores.

3. One psychological fallacy of this method lies in the burden which it lays upon the moderns to reproduce the religious experiences out of which the original Biblical categories grew. As though this were a very simple summer afternoon pastime. Belief in miracles, we are informed, is a contemporary challenge "To learn anew the power of prayer, to release through our lives a superhuman Spirit into human affairs, to do things which cannot be done, until men find it easy to believe in God because of the evident marvels of his presence in us and through us—this is what it really means to believe in miracle" (p. 166). There is no denying that this would be to believe in miracle. But if we were allowed to have our choice, without any reflection upon Liberals, we would prefer to turn over this particular demonstration to the Jesus of the Gospels. And when we remember that, with His personality, His relation to God, His ability to do the impossible, His power to work miracles, He

had to supplement His earthly life with His crucifixion and His resurrection, to succeed in any degree in making men believe in Him and in the God who sent Him, we may be pardoned if we question the ability of the Liberals to deliver the experience capable of providing an adequate substitute for that recorded in the Bible.

Take another category, the Trinity. Dr. Fosdick's treatment of this profound subject is contained in two paragraphs. He says:

"If then, any one is troubled about this formula of the Trinity, the liberal prescription is familiar: translate the formula back into the experience from which it came. The Trinity that matters is the Trinity of experience." (P. 188.)

Nothing daunted by this challenge, the Liberal seems to feel that any modern is perfectly capable of reproducing the religious experience out of which this category grew. Dr. Fosdick describes this experience thus:

"To know God as Father of all, God as revealed in the historic Son, and God as the unseen Friend in our hearts—that is to know the Trinity of the New Testament" (p. 188 f.).

The mere suggestion that an individual Christian, or any present-day group of Christians, can translate the Trinity back into a religious experience adequate to justify rephrasing this category in modern terms, ignores the historical fact that the Trinity was not born out of the matrix of individual religious experience, but out of the womb of humanity's long centuries of religious experience, conceived by the aid of the incarnation, crucifixion, resurrection, ascension, Pentecost, and the operation of the Holy Spirit in a unique way in the lives of the early Christians. This at least is the New Testament background out of which this category of the Trinity came. Here again we may be pardoned, if we are allowed to choose, for preferring to turn over to the Bible characters the phrasing of our doctrine of the Trinity, rather than to be restricted to the acceptance of its rephrasing out of the religious experience of twentieth century Christians, be they Liberals or Conservatives.

4. Another psychological fallacy found in this method lies in the assumption, that whenever a modern finds difficulty with an ancient category, it is the ancient category which is always at fault. Psychology has discovered that three elements enter into all unbelief: The belief, the interpretation of the belief, and the unbeliever. Any one of these elements is capable of causing the reaction of unbelief. The reviewer's book on *Acute and Chronic Unbelief* is a study of unbelief, misbelief, and belief, from this angle. Subnormal and abnormal religious experiences are prolific causes of intellectual religious difficulties. The time has arrived when some attention should be devoted to the psychological study of the unbeliever. When his religious health is restored and his religious habits have become normal, his intellectual difficulties are greatly reduced. Here is a most fruitful field—which is sorely neglected—in which to work for the solution of modern difficulties. Working directly with the unbeliever has the advantage of being purely constructive. By this method interest is stimulated in the development of deeper personal religious experience. A more sympathetic appreciation of the religious experience of others also naturally results. It tends to produce the type of culture of which Dr. Fosdick speaks in this passage:

"A man of catholic culture should know how to be at home in all ages, to appreciate wisdom and spiritual quality in all forms of thought; he should drink the water of life from Greek vases and Jewish water-jars as well as from modern faucets, and whoever lacks such culture robs himself of his racial inheritance of experience and truth" (p. 96).

We are now beginning to recognize the genealogy of this fascinating theory. It is, indeed, a very old theory in modern dress. In fact, we would not be surprised to discover that it is the offspring of "the ancient solution"—allegory. Dr. Fosdick gives us our clue, when he remarks: "The liberal emphasis rests upon experience; we regard that, rather than mental formulas, as the permanent continuum of the Gospel" (p. 183). We are perfectly familiar with this periodic shift of emphasis from



doctrine to experience. It is the characteristic and historic protest of individualism against institutionalism.

As Professor Albrecht Ritschl, the German theologian, felt the historic foundations of Christianity crumbling under the feet of believers, due to Strauss' attack upon the historical character of the Jesus of the Gospels, he conceived the idea of saving Christianity by lifting it up out of the reach of historic facts—exactly the maneuver to which Dr. Fosdick resorts. To accomplish this object he worked out his clever value-judgment theory. In it he also insisted that historic facts have only a secondary value. By skillfully shifting the center of the value of the historic life of Jesus to the moral realm, he temporarily saved Christianity from Strauss' attack. His idea was enthusiastically received, and he was heralded as the savior of Christianity.

At first sight Ritschl's theory seemed to be harmless and helpful. But as well-intended as it was, so far as Ritschl was concerned, it opened the way to play fast and loose with historic facts. Nietzsche brought out its fallacy in a most unexpected way. A pupil of Ritschl's, he took his value-judgment theory, and, putting an opposite estimate upon the value of the teachings and life of Jesus, arrived at exactly the opposite conclusion. Dr. Fosdick's theory is Ritschl's value-judgment theory revived, dressed in modern garb, and brought down to date. And it possesses exactly the same fallacies. Allow an intense believer like Ritschl or Dr. Fosdick to answer the question: What contribution has Jesus made to the life of the world? and the theory works like a charm. But let a Nietzsche, or some modern follower of his, answer that question, and you face a very different array of facts. This is the peril of every subjective theory. It delegates altogether too much power to the individual, and inevitably belittles the objective, the historic, the institutional.

The religious history of the centuries unfailingly confirms this truth: Every time the emphasis is disproportionately

shifted to the realm of experience, destructive individualistic movements have arisen to disturb the peace and unity of the church. It is no accident that Dr. Fosdick has become the rallying center for the most spectacular individualistic religious movement of our day. The theory which he has been teaching for the last ten years is pregnant with individualism. And individualism, when it hath conceived, bringeth forth revolt against institutional authority. And this type of inner-ecclesiastical revolt, when it hath conceived, bringeth forth symbolism. The Bible, creeds, confessions of faith, denominational doctrinal standards, are all eventually reduced to symbols which are received with private reservations. And symbolism, when it hath conceived, bringeth forth allegory. And allegory, when it hath conceived, bringeth forth occultism.

Are not these the outstanding symptoms of the religious condition of our modern age? Dr. Fosdick prescribes Liberalism as the only remedy. But a Liberalism that feeds the germs of the very disease of subjectivism, which is the cause of all our trouble, holds out little hope as a cure. The real remedy will be discovered when some one compounds a solution of truth in which the objective and historic elements are proportionately combined with those of religious experience. If in the meantime, however, any modern Christian is in need of an intellectual stimulant or tonic, Dr. Fosdick's book may be recommended. But no one must make the blunder of taking it as a substitute for the nourishing truth of the sincere milk of the Word, for it is short in calories. It lacks the necessary number of vitamins and proteids for a food.

ALBERT CLARKE WYCKOFF.

#### JOHN HENRY JOWETT <sup>2</sup>

The writing of Dr. Jowett's biography could not have been an easy matter, not because of the meagerness of the data, but because of the character of the man. His shy and winsome per-

---

<sup>2</sup> John Henry Jowett, C. H., M. A., D.D. By Arthur Porritt. Foreword by the Archbishop of Canterbury. New York: George H. Doran Company. 1924. Pp. 304.

sonality aroused no antagonisms, although it disappointed many by forbidding all attempts at intimacy. His public utterances were so free from the controversial that they furnish scant material for debate. The very air of spiritual detachment that enveloped him like an aura created an attitude of reverential awe and admiration which could not but militate against the analytical spirit and serve to dull the critical faculty. Then, too, he has been gone a comparatively short time, and Mr. Porritt, his biographer, was a trusted and valued friend. That might easily mean a certain lack of perspective and a tendency toward excessive adulation.

In spite of all these handicaps, however, Mr. Porritt has given us a noble book. It is distinguished by a delightful commingling of frankness and restraint. And that is as it should be. Nothing is kept back largely because there was nothing to hide. Dr. Jowett's life was not an open book, to be scanned by every passer-by—not by any means. Just as did those other spiritual giants, Henry Drummond and Phillips Brooks, so did he preserve with sedulous care a personal holy of holies into whose sanctities the curious were never permitted to intrude. Even in his Yale Lectures, when he honestly tried to lay bare his soul, he did not quite succeed.

But there was not one sordid page in the record. There was no suggestion of a skeleton in his closet. He could have said, as did Spurgeon when he faced the great adventure, "Tell it all; there is nothing to hide." Therefore, Mr. Porritt could write the story with a free hand, guarding himself only against the inevitable tendency to fulsome eulogy. And he does both the one and the other. In successive chapters, of cumulative power and interest, he traces the development of the Yorkshire lad from his early years in Halifax, through his student days at Airedale College, Edinburgh University, and Mansfield College, Oxford, among his multitudinous tasks in his successive pastorates, to his exhausting labors in behalf of world peace and his death. And he makes it a most delightfully interesting record.

The boy's studious disposition flavored with a delicious sense of humor inherited from his mother, the youth's avid interest in public affairs and growing ambition to become a member of Parliament, the young preacher's astonishing success from the preaching of his first sermon as a settled minister, the widening vision of the aging prophet, and the dedication of those last weary days to the attempted realization of the vision which he had caught, are all limned in colors that would delight the soul of an artist.

In his careful and vivid record of Dr. Jowett's career Mr. Porritt's best work is done, not in his description of the amazing work accomplished, but in his illumination of the varied character of that work. Who, for instance, except those who knew him from the beginning, would ever have suspected that this quiet, self-contained man, filled with a horror of everything bizarre, began his public work by appropriating the methods of the Salvation Army, leading his forlorn group of followers through the village, speaking from the curb at every corner, and finally filling his church with astonished hearers? And who, of the multitudes who knew him only as a preacher of compelling power are aware of the fact that he was also an executive of the finest type? "Jowett applied himself thoroughly and conscientiously to the details of church organization" (p. 75). He always organized his people for practical Christian service, and he planted in the "grim and unsavory slums" of Birmingham the Digbeth Institute, which was called the finest equipped mission in England.

Indeed, one of the real bits of service that Mr. Porritt renders us is his faithful setting forth of the real Jowett. Far from being a religious recluse or an impractical idealist expressing his spiritual visions in sermons alone, he was a genuine religious leader, maintaining throughout the years a vital interest in human affairs, keeping in close touch with existing conditions and contributing definitely and largely to the solution of social problems. When, at thirty-two, he left Newcastle-on-Tyne, the



Newcastle Daily Chronicle made the statement that his preaching had "purified and sweetened the business life of the Tyne-side." And when he was called from Carr's Lane, Birmingham, to New York, "the Lord Mayor took the unprecedented step of sending Jowett a memorial signed by the City magistrates expressing concern at the possibility of his removal from Birmingham and adding a hope that 'in the interests of all that is best in our civic life' he might see his way clear to continue in the pastorate of Carr's Lane Chapel." No man can make such an impression upon the life of large civic centers without being something of a real social force.

Dr. Jowett grew steadily, however, throughout his public ministry. That fact is made very plain in the biography, and the various aspects of that growth are touched with a sure and accurate hand. He grew in every way. His unique powers for felicitous phrase and exquisite imagery were saved from being mere rhetorical rocks upon which his homiletical bark was in danger of being wrecked and were transformed into effective vehicles for truth by the responsibility of succeeding Dr. Dale at Birmingham. That "braced Jowett to the exercise of his fullest powers. There is a sense in which it made him. He confessed to a friend that he had been in peril of mere prettiness in preaching, but carrying on Dr. Dale's work proved his deliverance." (P. 72.)

Of the young and immensely popular preacher at Newcastle-on-Tyne Rev. David Young, a veteran minister, said: "My impression is that he developed very much in those six years in his Newcastle ministry. When I knew him first, Emerson used to be much on his lips and probably counted for something in his preaching. But as he settled to the inevitable daily experience and came in frequent contact with the sick, the dying and the bereaved, the struggling people of every sort, and especially those harassed by the personal problems of the soul, he found the only resource and solution in the appeal for an accepted Christ." And, whereas the passion for immediate

spiritual results from the preaching of the Gospel is apt to grow less with many men as they get on in years, with Dr. Jowett it increased until it literally saturated his preaching. Witness this passage from one of his letters, written from his New York pastorate: "I deliberately sought to bring things to an issue, and so I had decision forms printed on our Calendars. I am quietly and confidently expecting that a large number have to-day 'crossed the line.' There is nothing for it in New York, of all places in the world, but to bring the soul close against the eternal realities; and this winter, God helping me, I mean to do it with all my strength."

While it is true, as has been said, that he was a real civic force throughout his life, the fact must be noted, that he grew in social vision and passion after his experience in New York and his return to England. To use Mr. Porritt's words: "The years after his return from New York revealed a Jowett whose whole outlook had been transformed, broadened and deepened by his experiences in America. From an individualism almost as sharp as that of Martin Luther the seven years in America caused Jowett to expand his horizon so that—though he remained an individualist—he recognized that the social and international aspects of Christianity must be stressed even if only to remove the barriers, social, economic and racial, which block the way to individual redemption through the grace of Christ." That transformation is most interestingly traced, culminating in a poignantly beautiful description of those last tragic and triumphant days devoted to the Peace Campaign.

Four chapters are devoted to an interpretation of Dr. Jowett's message, methods, and character. And here the best sort of judgment is shown by the biographer, in that he lets Dr. Jowett serve as his own interpreter. Generous quotations from his public utterances and personal correspondence illumine his faith, his spirit, and his methods of work far more clearly than any comments of the writer possibly could. And those excerpts have been wisely chosen and are most effectively used.

They show not only the dominant characteristics of the man and his ministry, but also the contributing causes of those characteristics.

If Dr. Jowett was not a great theologian, it was because theology as such had no attractions for him. "Mere speculation was not his bent. He appealed to faith which is intuitional, rather than to belief which is intellectual." Therefore it is difficult to classify him as belonging to any particular school of thought. Of his loyalty to the central truths of the Gospel, however, no one can have any doubt. For his first sermon at Newcastle the young preacher took as his text those familiar words, "I am determined to know nothing among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified," and said: "By God's grace I want to make that the keynote of my ministry." And he did. Maintaining an open mind toward the new expressions of the old truth, he never lost sight of the truth. "Let us look very reverently and expectantly at the new presence, and we may find that in the very moment when we are tempted to think that we are pathetically bereaved we are face to face with the risen Lord and in open communion with His grace" (p. 226).

Whether or not Dr. Jowett was the greatest preacher of his time will always be an open question. The infinite variation in human need will forever preclude the possibility of agreement in the selection of the outstanding figure in the pulpit of any age. One all-important fact, however, is established beyond cavil or question, and that is, that this prince of preachers, whose message proved a source of almost unexampled inspiration to multitudes, attained his extraordinary eminence by paying the price. He who told the young theologues at Yale Divinity School that "preaching is not easy and that it costs blood" spoke with authority because he spoke from experience.

Preaching was his passion and his life, and to it he literally gave his life. He was a tireless and rigidly systematic worker, rising early and beginning his day's work at six o'clock. "Bible

study occupied his best hours—the early morning hours.” Refusing to be dragged from his chosen work by the multitudinous invitations which poured in upon him, he concentrated his God-given powers upon the supreme business of preaching. He loathed the limelight. He avoided publicity, that *sine qua non* of the modern pulpit. “All his energies, spiritual, mental, nervous and physical, were concentrated on preaching and preparation for preaching.” He not only avoided all side paths and kept to the main track, toiling terribly in order to perfect his message, but he attended with sedulous care to the development of his own spiritual life. The young moderns who boast that they have not looked at the Greek Testament since their graduation from the seminary will find scant comfort in the life story of this man. And those misguided ministers who impoverish themselves spiritually in an endless round of activities will find less. “A minister must fence off his quiet and secluded hours and suffer no interferences or obtrusion.” He feared above everything else the “restless scattering of energies over a multiplicity of interests, leaving no margin of time or strength for ‘receptive and absorbing communion with God’ ” (p. 232).

And this popular idol and intimate of the eminent knew how to pray. He prayed daily for those to whom he was ministering. Unable to call often, he made it his habit to “take the list of Church members from the Year Book and pray, on his knees, for every individual member.” He prayed for them, not in any perfunctory way, but with as thorough a knowledge of their individual needs as he could get, pouring out his soul in passionate pleading that all those needs might be met by the infinite grace of God.

It is a superb biography, a most inspiring book. Young ministers will find more in it than in the Yale Lectures of Dr. Jowett himself. It is one of the few volumes which deserve, and ought to get, frequent re-reading.

ANDREW GILLIES.



THE CHRIST OF THE LOGIA <sup>3</sup>

My chief adverse criticism upon this book concerns the title. Why should a book be named from one chapter out of thirteen, with no hint in subtitle or elsewhere of the range and variety of the contents? I am well aware that it is a prevalent custom thus to name a book from a single feature of its contents. My contention is, that it is a bad custom and ought to be abandoned. It seems to me particularly unfortunate in this case. The real interest and value of the book lie in the fact that it contains a brief, succinct, and effective discussion of a full dozen salient problems in New Testament criticism, of which this matter of the Logia is but one.

If my own personal predilections are allowed to speak, I find several of these discussions even more interesting and helpful than the one to which is given the title role. Perhaps enough has been said about this. I wish the reader to know that this covers far more ground—and very important ground at that—than is suggested by the title of the books. It is, of course, not a continuous discussion, but a group of essays on kindred themes, evidently written and delivered at different times and collected into one volume. It is a sort of one-man symposium. There is some repetition in allied essays—conspicuously in the two dealing with John (v and ix), yet the repetition is not tiresome, but on the contrary helpful to a clear understanding of the issues involved.

The foregoing strictures are not to be construed, however, into depreciation of Dr. Robertson's essay on the Christological significance of the Logia. Those who are cognizant of the discussion concerning Q (see Harnack's *The Sayings of Jesus*) are aware that this hypothetical source behind our canonical Matthew is alleged by Harnack and others to have been devoid of the Christology and soteriology so clearly evident, as modern study has shown, even in Mark. In his characteristically easy fashion

---

<sup>3</sup>The Christ of the Logia. By A. T. Robertson, M. A., D. D., LL.D., Litt. D. New York: George H. Doran Co. 1924. Pp. 247.

Dr. Robertson carries us through the literature of the subject and then gives us the results of his own careful and original study of the document. The gist of the problem is, whether there was in Q a doctrine about Christ and statements concerning His death and resurrection. Dr. Robertson has produced a thoroughly adequate critique of the discussion, states the various phases of critical opinion, which is by no means unanimous as regards either the extent or character of the document, and concludes with a clear-cut expression of his own judgment on the matter. This is his conclusion, which is abundantly fortified by an induction of the facts:

"It is now clear that one has in Q the same essential picture of Jesus as the Christ that we find in the other Gospels and in Paul's Epistles. . . . In Q Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, the Son of Man. One may explain it as one will, but the fact remains. . . . We come back, therefore, in our earliest document about Jesus to the same high estimate of our Lord which we find in the latest portrait. The lines are simpler and the shading is lighter, but the essential features of the God-Man are in Q. The controversy concerning the Person of Christ is not ended by Q. . . . It is manifest that the impression made by Jesus during His ministry was all that the Gospels represent it to be. The heart of it all is in Q." (P. 37 ff.)

As has already been said these thirteen essays touch upon salient points in New Testament criticism. The field is wide. Dr. Robertson covers it by selecting strategic points. He touches upon the Marcan question as regards both the Christological and the more strictly literary problems (II, x). As already intimated, he has two chapters on the Johannine question, and he has one on the Lucan interpretation of Christ, one on the position of Judas Iscariot, one on the great question of ethics and eschatology in the teaching of Jesus, one on Matthew's interpretation of Christ, etc. This will serve to introduce the reader to this very broad and comprehensive group of discussions.

There are several things of interest to be said about Professor Robertson. One point is his amazing output. In the front

of this volume there is an entire closely printed page listing his books. How a man can produce so much in the way of literary output without running to emptiness is something I have never been able to understand. Perhaps the fact that he has concentrated upon the New Testament, the richest mine of thought in all the world, may have more than a little to do with it. There is a hint in this very book now before us of the method by which Dr. Robertson's well is kept full.

His learning is almost unbelievable. He has the telescopic eye that seems to scan the whole vast field of New Testament critical literature and miss nothing of value. Back of every one of these essays is a knowledge of the discussion almost exhaustive. But the method of use is the most interesting thing about it. A man may have immense learning, and yet weary us to death by his method of unloading it upon us. To read some books is like climbing a hill of sand which threatens to engulf us at every step. Dr. Robertson's learning is selected, sifted, apropos—and never overloaded. He knows how not to know, or at any rate he knows how not to inform us that he knows. The essays are brief, but contain the finest of the wheat.

Another item to Dr. Robertson's credit is that his essays are no mere registry of other men's opinions. He has read his documents, he has lived in the New Testament, and, best of all, he has done his own thinking. He is always moderate, sane, constructive, fair, and amply grounded on facts. One feels confidence in following him, for while he is conservative he is never narrow, hidebound or partisan. He tells us what he believes and why. He stands firmly for the rights of criticism. He is content to leave unsettled problems unsettled. He adopts no magisterial tones and all the way through his book talks like a sane man to other sane men, which same thing is none too common in this mad world. I am reminded by the vein of thought into which I have drifted that I came to criticize Caesar not to eulogize him, but, really, appreciation is criticism when the appreciation is deserved. Let me end with the quotation of a beau-

tiful passage in the last essay. After saying, "It is curious how easily we deceive ourselves when we seize upon one or another aspect of Christ's life and work," he proceeds:

"After all it is not easy to see all sides of a mountain at once. We must get different angles one at a time. The stature of Christ fills the horizon for us all. No one of us sees all of Him. He reigns in our hearts now and here. He will reign more fully when He comes again. Meanwhile we can hasten His coming by holy living and by pushing on the work of the kingdom of God." (P. 246 f.)

LOUIS MATTHEWS SWEET.

#### NINETEENTH CENTURY EVOLUTION AND AFTER <sup>4</sup>

This is a notable book which no reader who has even casually dipped into the rather turgid stream of controversy concerning evolution can afford to miss. As one who is reputed to be interested in the subject of evolution the author of this review is in almost daily receipt of letters asking for books either for or against evolution. This is no way to study a subject. It means that an antecedent bias of a casual and hearsay sort will be stiffened into an invincible prejudice based on one-sided reading.

I am inclined to think that prejudice of this sort, grounded on selected information (procured with one eye bandaged), is more hopeless than that which is due to ignorance without adulteration. It is perfectly proper for one who has really studied evolution in an honest and impartial way to argue for or against it *on the basis of his findings*; this has often been done without leading to charges of intellectual heresy. But for one confessedly ignorant of evolution to ask for a book *pro* or *con* is a self-betrayal from the start. It is a betrayal of one's intelligence, the final outcome of which is that the unwillingness to think becomes an inability to think.

The beauty of Marshall Dawson's book is that it is neither *pro* nor *con*. By this characterization it is not meant that it is

---

<sup>4</sup>Nineteenth Century Evolution and After. By Marshall Dawson. New York: The Macmillan Co. 1923. Pp. xi + 145.



neutral or straddling; it may best be described as both *pro* and *con*. That is to say, the writer is neither an unqualified adherent nor an unqualified opponent of the theory. He discriminates, analyzes, criticizes, and evaluates—a far more difficult process than to construct either panegyric or polemic. Incidentally, it is immeasurably more valuable to the sincere student who is unwilling to be led either backward or forward by the nose. Nothing is more imperatively needed just now than true criticism of evolutionary theory, which involves the historical investigation, analysis, and constructive valuation of a subject which has become complex and difficult to understand. The result of Mr. Dawson's method is that he is both informative and illuminative to his readers. His method is fundamentally historical. His argument is of the nature of an appeal from Philip drunk to Philip sober. That is, instead of taking his position outside the evolutionary movement and thus appraising it from an external viewpoint, he takes his position on the inside and uses the trend of the movement itself as a basis of ascertaining its possible value.

The result is that he is able to show that the religiously destructive elements in the movement belong to its earlier, tentative, less instructed beginnings, and that as it has gone on it has in some measure sloughed off its own early mistakes. He is thus able to show that the destructive, anti-theistic, and anti-Christian implications, which have been attached to the hypothesis or drawn from it, may be described with a great measure of truth as the sins of its youth. And may I, at this point, call the attention of the esteemed reader to a principle which is too often overlooked. It does not do to study a subject like this—which has feet and is on the move—solely on the basis of ancient authorities. The theory of evolution has had a history, and he who would study it well must be mindful of that history. Our author has thus been mindful, hence his title, *Nineteenth Century Evolution and After*—especially “after.” As I say, evolution has had a history. It has not remained where its orig-

inal sponsors left it. To argue for or against the evolution of Darwin himself or the evolution of the great triumvirate, Huxley, Tyndall, and Spencer, is to deal, as if it were *apropos* to the movement, with much that is obsolete and much more that is obsolescent. Moreover, the changes which have come over evolutionary interpretation since the early days have not been casual or unrelated. They have been cumulative, connected, moving in a very definite direction, pointing to a very clearly discernible goal. It is this movement in the development of the evolutionary theory which underlies and conditions Mr. Dawson's treatment.

The gist of the whole discussion, which is brilliant and suggestive at every point, is that the anti-religious interpretation, which was so closely interwoven with the first formulation of the theory, has been progressively eliminated in the course of the development, because it was no genuine part of the theory itself, but a philosophic parasite. This is the conditioning thesis of Mr. Dawson's admirable book, in the course of which he applies it to the fundamental Christian convictions about man and his world.

It is not necessary to follow out the discussion in full. A few salient features will be pointed out. These will be sufficient to introduce the book and, it is hoped, to awaken the reader's desire to know it at first hand. Of Mr. Dawson himself it is enough to say, that in him the two interests, in religion and in science, happily meet and are blended. He is a clergyman, well-taught and widely traveled, who holds a justly deserved honorary degree in science. After being missionary, pastor, and chaplain, he is now enjoying a period of retirement for study, but will surely be heard of later. It is a striking fact that he is the author not only of the book under review but also of an unusual and original book on prayer (*Prayer that Prevails*).

Mr. Dawson's insight and originality, as well as his gift of vivid and picturesque phrase, are well seen in the first chapter

of the work here under discussion, entitled *Growing a Backbone*. He begins with the assertion that the Bible is built on the conception that man is a "moral vertebrate." From this point on in the book science and religion are blended in a way which is as stimulating as it is attractive. The first condition of evolution, he argues, is the refusal to accept adaptation as complete or final. At every stage it involves a push against environment. "Nature's premium is put upon the limited response"—active, not passive, response to environment is the real condition of advance.

According to Mr. Dawson, there is no contradiction between the Biblical account of man and the scientific, because the Bible mentions no method of divine creation. This is strikingly in contrast with Plato and the Babylonians, who give details of the creative process.

There is then no contradiction between science and its evolutionary theory of man. "There is nothing whatever in this [evolutionary] sketch of man's prehistoric development which is contrary to the religious teaching that God created man" (p. 11). This preliminary period before man's historic appearance he calls the "gestation-period" which in the life of the race corresponds to the prenatal period in the life of the individual. It was simply a preparation for the emergence of the moral individual, with countless foreshadowings of the moral issue which was to be worked out in his life. As a comment on Romans 8:22-23, Mr. Dawson says:

"Whoever retains a healthy, sensitive, unpampered moral nature, has this same realization in him, over which St. Paul at times agonized. For his very organism has been built up and perfected through utmost effort. Every unit in his backbone is a triumphal monument erected by Nature to commemorate a valiant decision in some life-and-death struggle. Man's body, backbone and brain constitute a record of forward-reaching efforts, and of decisive victories, won against tremendous odds, during the immemorial span of prehistoric life. My body itself

is nothing less than a compendium and history of the decisive battles of geologic time." (P. 12.)

I should like to go on from page to page in the fashion of running comment, but space forbids. I wish, however, to point out that Mr. Dawson uses the material furnished by the evolutionists themselves to establish, against the background of progress interpreted in terms of struggle and victory, the supreme fact of man's freedom and moral responsibility. Mr. Dawson holds that the central defect of nineteenth century evolution was a shallow and therefore false theory of human nature, which in turn was the outcome of a naturalistic interpretation of the evolutionary process as a whole. The great lesson to be drawn from man's history is, that there is "*something more involved in the process than the visible, material or physical outer environment*" (p. 17). The central fact of man's life is, that no more for him than for natural beings, is there an automatically guaranteed path upward and no corresponding path downward. Progress is a heroic process of fighting against the gravitation of the "flesh." The denial of a moral probation in human life has been well-nigh fatal to the world. "Boneless religion" which consists in "eulogizing" man for his great advance, with the accompanying denial of sin and the fall, has blighted religion and put society and the moral order in imminent peril. Nineteenth century evolution guaranteed progress as an automatic, non-moral process and, by doing so, "disarmed Christianity." Twentieth century evolution withdraws the guarantee, so that Christianity may resume its warfare. "Religion and Science must get together, first, upon a sound theory of human nature." "Adam must be restudied."

These brief and fragmentary quotations will serve to hint at the general nature of the discussion, although, of course, they can give no adequate idea of the richness, both in thought and expression, which characterizes it.

LOUIS MATTHEWS SWEET.



THE BIBLICAL IDEA OF GOD <sup>5</sup>

A number of important works on the doctrine of God have appeared within the last few years. Some of them have been quite profound, argumentative, and philosophical. A few have professedly endeavored to present the Biblical doctrine, but have been based on the Bible, not in its complete integrity, but rather as it has been more or less shredded and reduced by subjective preconceptions.

The special merit of Dr. Thomas' book lies in the fact that it presents the full-toned Biblical idea of the Divine Being. While there are a few unnecessary concessions to the prevailing criticism, as we shall point out, yet our author has for the most part followed the Biblical teaching closely, and therefore his presentation is eminently satisfying to both the intellect and the heart. This reminds us to say at this point that such a picture of God is one of the strongest apologetics for the Bible; for what man, or what body of men, in those olden times could have invented so exalted a doctrine of God? Compare the Biblical conception with the animism and polytheism of the ethnic religions.

Our author starts out well. He resolves to follow the teaching of the Bible to see where it will lead him by the empirical process. Four fundamental facts are stressed: First, in the Bible God is presented in a concrete way, not in the abstract way of human metaphysics; second, He is set forth as a personal Being, and that makes the whole conception luminous; third, He is depicted as one God, and only one, and that gives us monotheism pure and simple; fourth, He is a spiritual Being, which is involved in the conception of Him as personal.

These ideas of God are taught throughout the Bible from first to last. Dr. Thomas follows the Biblical teaching in chronological sequence, and proves that the foregoing concep-

---

<sup>5</sup>The Biblical Idea of God. By Rev. M. Bross Thomas, A.M., D.D., Professor Emeritus of Biblical Literature of Lake Forest College. The Bross Lectures, 1923. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1924. Pp. 197.

tions, which are so clear and rational, are most effectively presented in Holy Writ. The fact is, the simple presentation of them in the Bible is one of the most convincing proofs of the divine existence, for who could have invented such a conception of God by mere rational processes? The only adequate explanation is, that God revealed Himself in the Bible, and therefore He must exist, and the Bible must be His medium of special revelation. Thus Dr. Thomas' work is a sort of double-acting argument.

Our author, without being especially polemical, delivers many effective blows against the hacking and reducing Biblical criticism. For the most part, he upholds the complete integrity and inspiration of the Bible, and accepts it at its face value. Still, at a few places he makes needless concessions, and this fact constitutes what we regard as the only defect in his engaging and convincing book. The weak points occur in the section from page 32 to 46, where he deals with the idea of God during "the primitive period." Here, instead of stalwartly upholding the historicity of the early chapters of Genesis, he tries to make it appear that the God idea is just as effectively taught if those chapters are myth or allegory. We wonder that he did not see the weakness of his logic here; for, if those chapters are so largely mere human inventions and contain so many scientific and historical errors, will not many people conclude that the whole Biblical narratives may, after all, be only human conjecture? On the other hand, suppose the Genetical chapters are actual history, then we cannot help knowing that, from the very start, the Biblical writers had the true monotheistic conception; and that of itself would prove that they must have been divinely inspired.

Moreover, Dr. Thomas is not logically consistent. On page 42 he represents primitive man as "a rational and moral creature." Then he adds: "He is placed in the Edenic garden, to till its soil and enjoy its fruits, but he is under a command. There is a prohibition." But that is the literal Biblical repre-

sensation of man's primitive condition; it is not at all the representation of the evolutionists and the radical Biblical critics. They picture primitive man as a bestial creature of the jungle, a savage semi-brute, engaged in a fierce struggle with other animals for existence. On page 47, after having canvassed the whole "primitive period," the author says: "Here, then, we have presented in these brief eleven chapters of primitive *history*, in unmistakable terms, in concrete *historic* form, in a record of persons and events, two essential conceptions in the Biblical idea of God." (The italics are ours.) Yes, but such statements are not in logical consistence with the author's previous concession that the first three chapters of Genesis may be mythical or legendary or allegorical. Let us here apply to himself what he says so acutely in another context (p. 112): "In either case his [the prophet's] conception of the divine nature and character remain the same, although if arising out of actual experience, its expression would have a force and poignancy not otherwise to be obtained."

How true! It is history that gives us facts and real assurance. Myth and fiction can never give the impression of reality. A historic religion, such as the Christian religion is, could not have a mythical origin. Neither could a religion of reality have originated in a fiction of the human mind.

But criticism aside. In dealing with the patriarchal period, Dr. Thomas, we are happy to say, plants himself on a firm historic foundation. Here he is not hampered by the rationalistic *Zeitgeist*. The patriarchs are real characters. The personal God who created all things, the Jehovah Elohim of Genesis 1 and 2, appears to them, and makes actual revelations to them. He is no "tribal god," no "clan god," making "clients" of his arbitrarily chosen "favorites." No, He is the universal God who reveals Himself partially in nature and more clearly to His people.

Dr. Thomas deals with the Mosaic period in the same realistic fashion. He accepts the Biblical record as true history,

hence he derives his view of God directly from what the Bible teaches regarding this epochal period. Here he finds ethical monotheism, just as he found it in the previous history. In this he does not follow the example of the dissecting Biblical critics, who, controlled by subjective views, cannot find ethical monotheism in the Bible until the time of Amos and Hosea. Nor does he find Jehovah a mere henotheistic god, but the universal God, who created the heavens and the earth, and yet who selected a chosen people to carry forward His plan of world-wide redemption.

In the time of the Judges there is a further revelation of the same God. The prophets did not discover or invent a new God, but constantly harked back to the God who had revealed His wisdom, power, and grace in the preceding periods. They constantly aimed at reformation, that is, the bringing of the people back to the true God from whom they had purposely and wickedly departed. The "ethical monotheism" of the olden times was to be restored. Yet through divine revelation they set forth higher conceptions of God, for the divine purpose is ever progressive.

The concluding chapter of Dr. Thomas' timely book is climacteric. The work grows in power and winsomeness. The teaching of Christ and His apostles does not introduce a new or a different God from the God of the Old Testament, but simply reveals Him more fully and more clearly, bringing out into the full light His Fatherhood, His love and grace and redemptive purpose, all of which were foretold by the old-time prophets and symbolized and foreshadowed by the Old Testament types. Thus the Bible is treated as an organism, and not as a welter of *disjecta membra*. Yes, it is the picture of God as the Bible portrays Him, with all His matchless attributes in perfect poise and proportion, that makes the divine idea so attractive and convincing, and that gives to Dr. Thomas' book its unique value and timeliness.

Many pertinent quotations might be given. One brief one



must suffice. Speaking of the Bible as a whole, he says: "The only rational position, it seems to me, is to accept it on its face value for what it claims to be" (p. 190).

A clarion voice speaks in this volume. Among the many jangling voices, it gives forth no uncertain sound. It is one more cheering sign, among many, of the persistent strength and the continual progress of evangelical faith in these crucial times. The author's style is clear, commanding, interesting, and as simple as the subject matter will permit. The author is sufficiently the scholar not to indulge in rhetorical flourishes, and for that very reason he uses the best rhetorical forms. We hope that other competent writers will emulate Dr. Thomas' example, and will give to the world the correlated teaching of the whole Bible on other cardinal doctrines of the Christian system. Such constructive work constitutes the best vindication of Biblical teaching.

LEANDER S. KEYSER.

#### PERSONALITY AND PSYCHOLOGY<sup>6</sup>

We have waited long for some one to appear with the knowledge and courage to write a book on Personality and Psychology such as Professor Buckham has given us. Intellectual daring is featured as the supreme virtue when it is enlisted to take issue with the past, but the same virtue, when it is called into service for the truth against any aggressive modern trend, is not even recognized. And yet it is always more dangerous to oppose live leaders than dead ones. Professor Buckham takes his intellectual reputation in his hands and in a very scholarly, courageous, and kindly spirit enters the lists to wage war against the selfless theory of personality which modern psychology is working so hard to establish. He is thoroughly at home in the field, he knows the material, and has thought his way through its confusing theories with unusual clarity.

---

<sup>6</sup> Personality and Psychology. By John Wright Buckham, Professor of Christian Theology in Pacific School of Religion. New York: George H. Doran Company. 1924. Pp. 202.

The book is divided into two parts. Part I: A Psychology of the Self. Part II: Selfless Psychology. This order of treatment is psychologically sound and greatly strengthens the convincing power of the work. Under Part I he has a review of the field of psychology of today, ending with a study of psychology and naturalism. Also chapters on What Is a Self? The Self and the Body; Consciousness, Self-consciousness and the Unconscious; Memory and Imagination; Thought; The Knowledge of Others; The Development of Personality. Under Part II he has chapters on The Psychology of Habit and Impulse; The Psychology of the Instincts; Behaviorism; Psychoanalysis; Suggestion and Autosuggestion; The Psychological Man; The Shaping of Selves.

As one reads over these titles and learns how comprehensive the field covered, the impression grows that this is a technical study of the problem and is meant for specialists in this field. But this impression is far from true. For the book is readable, the discussions are easily within the range of those who are not interested in the technical problems, and pervaded with a kindly spirit through which an occasional touch of genial humor plays to make it very human in its interest.

The new psychology not only has been guilty of denying the personality of God and His objective existence, it has also denied the personality of man. It is inevitable that the one denial should logically force the other. For personality in each case breathes the same intellectual air and lives upon the same cosmic truth. Professor Buckham starts with the confession that he is a personalist. And his book is a defense of his daring stand upon this dangerous and much attacked intellectual front.

Mr. Albert Edward Wiggam's *The New Decalogue of Science* is based upon a whole-hearted acceptance of the scientific and philosophical truth of naturalism, and Professor Buckham has very little difficulty in convincing his readers that naturalism is neither scientifically nor philosophically sound. A

couple of statements upon this subject will give some idea of his position. He says:

"It is extremely easy to let a scientific study of mental activity take the humanness out of humanity, the personality out of persons, the spirit out of the universe, and leave mere mechanisms, automata, products (or by-products) of natural forces. The progress of this New Naturalism has been both rapid and sinister. It seems likely not only to work havoc in personal character and ideals but also to turn many against science itself. . . . One would rather be 'a pagan suckled in a creed outworn' than to live in such a universe."

Then he adds:

"But Naturalism is not science; *it is only a deduction from natural science* and one whose soundness there is every reason to question. Indeed present-day science is itself suggesting a spiritual interpretation of the universe such as surpasses anything that the most ardent devotee of the life of the spirit has dreamed." (P. 23 f.)

With this introduction, Professor Buckham plunges into a study of the nature of a self. His discussion concludes with this definition:

"A self-conscious, self-directive, self-expressive, creative unity, continuous in change and developing either toward or away from moral personality—such is the self" (p. 39).

This skeleton of a self he next proceeds to clothe with flesh and blood. Naturally this next step brings us face to face with the problem of the relation of the self and the body. He keeps his intellectual footing upon very solid ground when he remarks:

"The wisdom and experience of the race have settled upon two working convictions regarding the relation of the body and the soul—that they are distinct, and that they are in a very close and intricate intimacy" (p. 40).

At no time is he willing to admit that the self and the body are identical. He gives three reasons which disprove identity: 1. The self is not rigidly bound to the body. 2. The self is the master of the body. 3. The self does not decay with the body.

Having arrived at this most favorable vantage ground for the defense of the existence of a self, he discusses the problem of Consciousness, Self-consciousness, the Unconscious. He charts out the psychic life in a series of zones, something like the way the Post Office Department has mapped out the United States. There are five zones: 1. Consciousness. 2. Co-consciousness. 3. Subconscious. 4. Unconscious. 5. Super-consciousness. Like the Parcel Post system, it costs personality more for service the greater a zone's distance from consciousness. And he concludes his discussion of this difficult and dangerous field of new psychological knowledge with this wise admonition:

"With the present emphasis upon the unconscious and sub-conscious it is of the utmost consequence to remember that 'the best and purest aspect of the mind, the aspect of it most highly developed and the most nobly human, is to be found not in the obscure shadows of the background, but in the clear light of consciousness' " (p. 64).

Modern psychology has been insisting that man is not a strictly rational being, and that thought is the slave rather than the master. Professor Buckham takes issue with this popular view and insists that thought is a distinct contributor toward the control of the self. Thought, to him, is something more than taking note of the flow of experience, it is the search for ends, the selection of ends, and the search for truth. He separates the function of thought into four parts: Reasoning, reflection, expression, intuition.

Freedom is the next priceless possession of the self which Professor Buckham refuses to surrender to the selfless psychology. Upon this important point he says:

"Self-development involves freedom, the denial of which—open or self-concealed—is characteristic of most of the new psychology. This denial, anticipated by Hobbes, has become familiar in the forms of determinism now in vogue. In the issue between the new psychology and ethics thus created the conclusive appeal for the reality of freedom is to *experience*." (P. 99 f.)



This, of course, is a very old line of defense, but Professor Buckham does not stop with the old vague, unanalyzed consciousness of being free; starting here, he moves forward to the experience of choice as John Laird has expressed it: "If anything can claim to be an experience, choice certainly can." Then he goes on from choice to creative consciousness and inner creativeness, both contributing additional evidence for freedom. The value of these two creative consciousnesses rests in the fact, that each is in a position to furnish its own objective creations in the material world and in the spiritual world where character is a factor, as evidence of freedom. This point is well brought out in this statement:

"Freedom as experience is more than a consciousness. It is a pragmatic consciousness. The consciousness is ratified in results. It is confirmed in what issues from conscious action. We know ourselves, that is, to be *creative*. The witness lies not only in consciousness but in the works that we do. There they stand, in wood, stone, color, printed page, or what not, *ours*, testifying to our creative deed. *Creation* is the greater act of freedom and proves the lesser, *choice*." (P. 100.)

This thought he carries to this additional evidence:

"Yet, greater than creativeness in the external environment is the *inner creativeness* by which we make ourselves other than we were" (p. 100).

This active, creative energy of personality, he finds, is carried forward by these independent functions of the self: Self-restraint, self-expression, self-giving. All of these functions of the self lead us into the social realm, and they all reach their highest qualities when dominated by love. For he says:

"Yet to stop with the personalizing of social conditions would be to miss the heart and soul of the whole matter. For it is the personal touch, the contact of person with person, directly and within the group, which counts most, and through which we shall approach nearer and nearer to that state of individual and social well-being in which each is for all and all for each." (P. 108.)

Having thus thoroughly established his "self" as a distinct and controlling part of personality, he turns to the consideration of the Selfless Psychology which is so popular among leading psychologists today. Three varieties of this he discusses: The Psychology of Habit and Impulse, The Psychology of Instincts, The Psychology of the Behaviorist.

Professor Dewey is the advocate of the first, Professor William McDougall of the second, and Professor Watson of the third. They are strong and influential psychologists, but their theories do not fare well at the hands of Professor Buckham. Professor Dewey in his theory assigns to thought only the limited function of regulating desires. Professor Buckham insists that thought is an aggressive participant in the discovery and appropriation of ends. The problem here sets between experience and selfhood. Professor Dewey contends that it is the experience that is of ultimate value. Professor Buckham insists that the ultimate value rests in the self that experiences. Upon this point he says:

"The fact that *an experience comes home to a self*—to you and me and the other man—is that which gives it meaning. And yet that is less than half of its significance. The major fact is that *experience is molded, interpreted, individualized by each self so as to become his own*. Each of us shapes his experience by means not of thought only, but of *will*, a term which has no meaning for Dewey except that of a set of habits." (P. 117.)

This point is summed up in this passage:

"To magnify experience at the expense of selfhood is to nullify experience itself. For if we experience *anything* we experience *selfhood*. That is the very core and center of experience." (P. 117.)

In the chapter on The Psychology of the Instincts, he discusses this theory as represented by its most distinguished representative, Professor William McDougall. In this psychology an instinct is thus defined:

"An inherited or innate psychophysical disposition which

determines its possessor to perceive, and to pay attention to, objects of a certain class, to experience an emotional excitement of a particular quality upon perceiving such an object, and to act in regard to it in a particular manner, or, at least, to experience an impulse to such action' " (p. 122).

This is Professor McDougall's classic definition. In this psychology each instinct has its corresponding emotion, and sentiment is "an organized system of emotional tendencies centered about some object." The human creature is the victim of this combination of instincts, emotions, and sentiments. Reason and the will are naturally slaves in this system. Professor Buckham thus comments upon the theory:

"This description of the instincts and emotions is extremely clearly drawn and ingenious. But is it valid? I find myself sharing the judgment of Professor Hobhouse when he says: 'Reason and will are with us as hereditary as any capacity to feel or any tendency to physical or mental response to special stimulus, and it is a mistake to found psychology on a row of separate instincts that may be variously combined.' " (P. 123.)

We should point out, as Professor Buckham does, that, in the latest edition of his *Outlines of Psychology* (1923), Professor McDougall greatly modifies his relation of emotions to instincts. But as is shown in the following passage, he has not changed the nature of his system. Professor Buckham thus describes it:

"He has broken avowedly and completely with the mechanistic psychology. He has found a place in his system for the cherished *principia* of the older psychology—reason, character, belief—everything but the operation of a Divine Mind upon the human. He has in fact rationalized, ethicized and spiritualized his psychology to the utmost possible extent that it will bear. And yet, it remains virtually a selfless psychology, for the reason that it conceives man as a creature of animal instincts and no more. The key to his nature is not spiritual but physical." (P. 125.)

It is pointed out that more important than the control of personality by instincts is the deeper fact of the control of in-

instincts. This psychological fact gives place to conscience and volition. And we are back again in a moral world. Professor Buckham concludes with this statement:

"To live by the instincts alone means to remain in the animal stage of existence; to live by conscience means to advance into the realm of the moral, the personal, the social" (p. 133).

Behaviorism is the latest arrival in the psychological household. And Professor John B. Watson is one of its most distinguished exponents. It differs from the other systems in that it denies the reality of consciousness. Professor Watson says: "The time seems to have come when psychology must discard all reference to consciousness." In the place of consciousness, conduct is substituted, and that strictly in the sense of the reaction of behavior. Behavior is thus defined: "The separate systems of reaction that the individual makes to his environment." The scheme is thus described by Professor Buckham:

"These reactions depend upon 'the total striped and unstriped muscular and glandular changes which follow upon a given stimulus.' All our conduct consists of responses, which are either explicit or implicit, habitual or hereditary reactions, including thinking, which consists of 'subvocal talking.'" (P. 135.)

Of course there is no place for personality, in the old sense of the term, in this psychology. There are in fact three fundamental constituents of the psychic life which behaviorism eliminates: Consciousness, thought, motive. Professor Buckham remarks that the attempt to get rid of consciousness is like trying to escape from one's shadow. And the denial of thought is equally difficult and unwarranted. It is begging the question. He says:

"If you say, I must think as I do because the reflexes of my muscles determine my thought, it is just as reasonable to hold that the muscles act as they do because one thinks as he does. Either assertion is an inference. All that the psychologist can show is concomitant activity. The behaviorist denies one side of the concomitance—thought. The denial is one which no one,



before him, had even *thought* of making—which denial is thus itself a thought.” (P. 139.)

In another place Professor Buckham remarks:

“Behaviorism decapitates both our emotions and our ideas. It denies the existence not only of a thinker but of an actor. Actions without an actor make as weird a dance as that of the famous bloodless categories. Does not a simple and sufficient refutation of behaviorism as an *ism* lie, in fact, in the existence and power of *motives*? Granted that we behave—well or ill—the question is *why* do we behave as we do? What makes the muscles—striped and unstriped—act diversely in different individuals? Why do men ever respond differently to the same situation? No answer is intelligent that leaves out the presence of motives, and of a self who has them.” (P. 141.)

We now come to the last argument against behaviorism. It is education. Intelligent control and behaviorism are incompatible. And Professor Buckham does not feel that education can be defined as a form of behavior. It is not simply, as Professor Thorndike states, a response to a situation. It is a conscious effort to change the situation. This is brought out in this passage:

“The fact is that every deterministic and naturalistic psychology and philosophy, including behaviorism, is refuted the instant one begins the process of education, that is, *to learn to behave intelligently*” (p. 142 f.).

The chapters on Psychoanalysis, Suggestion, and Auto-suggestion need no review; they follow accepted lines. So that we are brought face to face with the great problem of modern psychology—the psychological man. We must form some theory of personality and find some successful way to shape selves. To this problem the last two chapters are devoted. From what has preceded we are furnished with certain material out of which we are forced to develop selves. What is the material with which we must work? Professor Buckham thus gives it:

“A bundle of instincts, a gleam of self-consciousness, a modicum of intelligence, a potential touch of creativeness, a

glimmer of conscience—a body, a ‘soul’—what can be made out of these? They are vital potencies, but set in the midst of heavy hindrances; for we are begirt on every side by mountain walls of environment, hemmed in by jungles of heredity, conditioned not only by inner limitations but by possibilities of ill-adjustment and conflict among the very powers we possess.” (P. 190 f.)

Professor Buckham points out that something must be done. Life is urgent and imperative and compels some response; in the second place, something has been done; and in the third place, something more will yet be done. The power of the ideal and the moral nature of man leave us still in command of the situation, and they are going to lead us into the way of life. It is distinctly a problem of redemption from this present world. Here it is that religion comes to our assistance, particularly Christianity. This is the conclusion of the subject which Professor Buckham sums up in these words:

“This is the supreme enterprise of the Christian Faith. Christianity takes upon itself also the easier and gentler task of charity and comfort, sympathy and support. It is the good Samaritan among the religions. But its consuming passion is to lead men into a freer, nobler, diviner selfhood, to remake human nature, *to shape and reshape personality*, individual and social, until a Kingdom of God is established.” (P. 202.)

The remarkable contribution which this book makes to the understanding of the psychological field, for constructive religious thinking and working is invaluable. If only those who are carried away with the theories it discusses could read it, they would find great sobering truths with which to reckon.

However, it would not be fair to overlook the fact that there are four dangerous ideas in this book which are not fundamental, but which might lead to trouble: 1. The distinction between consciousness and self-consciousness. 2. The distinction between the individual and the person. 3. The super-consciousness idea and the introduction of intuition into the activities of thought. 4. The cordial approval of the power and

use of suggestion. When one is on guard against the dangers lurking in these ideas, which move too close to the realm of the occult to be comfortable, the book can be used with unusual satisfaction.

ALBERT CLARKE WYCKOFF.

BARON PAUL NICOLAY<sup>7</sup>

At the close of the second decade of the twentieth century there passed out of the student world of Russia a leader whose personal life had influenced many. This leader was Paul Nicolay, and the record of his life has come to be recounted by Greta Langenskjöld, a Swedish writer who has long known the Nicolay family, especially the eldest sister Marie on her estate at Monrepos in Finland. That the account of the life of Baron Nicolay came to be translated into English is due to the great friendship which existed between two well known student leaders, Robert P. Wilder and Baron Paul Nicolay. After the latter had succumbed to his final illness, his devoted sister, Baroness Marie Nicolay, wrote to Mr. Wilder asking if he had seen the Swedish rendering of her brother's life, and suggested that it be put into English. This Mr. Wilder's daughter Ruth kindly consented to do. Her year of attentive work has been rewarded by the appearance of this 12mo volume entitled Baron Paul Nicolay. It is an attractive publication, replete with illustrations showing the subject at different ages, at student conferences, his home, family, coat-of-arms, etc.

Because it treats of the life story of a man whose influence extended to more than one continent this book should appeal not only to Slavs, but to Scandinavians, Anglo-Saxons, and Orientals. The language is clear and direct, and it moves forward with the urge of charm and force. Just enough characteristics of the foreign element in the background have been allowed to remain to create a sense of uniqueness. A debt of gratitude is

---

<sup>7</sup> Baron Paul Nicolay. By Greta Langenskjöld. Translated from the Swedish by Ruth Evelyn Wilder. New York: George H. Doran Co. 1924. Pp. 251.



felt to the translator for her able work; as John R. Mott says: "The record of this inspiring life has moved me deeply, and I wish to convey to the translator my sense of profound appreciation of the service she has rendered in making this wonderful story available to those who could not have read the original work."

Nicolay believed in a practical Christianity. Influenced by Paschkov, whose sway was heightened in Russia by the influence of the English Lord Radstock, Nicolay had for a single dogma the belief in salvation through the atoning death of Jesus Christ and the firm conviction that this salvation was open to all. In St. Petersburg he sought to utilize every opportunity of coming into touch with spiritually hungry men, of winning souls to Christ. In the year 1897 Nicolay began regularly to gather around him a group of young men, probably members of the German Y. M. C. A., with whom he studied the Bible and whom he tried to interest in home missions. He traveled widely and from his command of languages was able to make his message understood by people of different tongues, although, as he said, personal work was always a cross to him—difficult to accomplish by one who was afflicted with too great self-consciousness.

In the spring of 1899 Dr. John R. Mott, at that time General Secretary of the World's Student Christian Federation, and Dr. Karl Fries, then its Swedish chairman, went to Helsingfors, where a group of students within the Y. M. C. A. purposed to organize an independent Student Christian Movement. There Baron Nicolay met both of these student leaders and was deeply impressed by them.

As Dr. Mott spoke of God calling some one to organize a Christian movement among Russia's students, Nicolay was forced to ask himself: "Could I be the man? Has God allowed me to grow up, study, and work in this country among Greek-Orthodox companions, has He allowed me to become familiar with the Russian language and customs, and given me besides



an evangelical home and contact with Christians of Western Europe, to prepare me rather than all others for *this* task?"

Yet he had never really lived the life of a student. What could he know, except through books or by hearsay, of the cold attic or cellar room where a student shivered over the borrowed book and sought warmth through a glass of often unsweetened tea, or argued into the small hours of the night about modern social, philosophical or ethical theories with companions as threadbare as the host himself? His outlook on life was, even in its religiousness, to a great extent matter-of-fact, thoroughly sober and practical. It might be said, probably with a slight exaggeration, that ideas were realized by him only in that measure in which they could be applied to life; words to him were significant primarily as the forerunners of action. The less real and less effective must, in accordance with his views, always be subjected to the more genuine; consequently the esthetic and intellectual must give way to the religious, which leads more directly to God—in his eyes the only great reality.

He who held such a view could hardly be attracted by the Russian intellectuals' vague and often impassioned ideals, their lack of moral and physical discipline, and their rationalism. Their finest traits of character—their impulsive cordiality and freedom from criticism of other people and the unlimited capacity for devotion to an ideal—often found expression in ways which could not attract him, who was primarily a man of will power.

To the Russian youth, to be religious was usually considered synonymous with being reactionary—the worst thing possible to them—and the empty space left by religion was gradually filled by politics. Socialistic and anarchistic theories became to most of these young men their religion. They spoke of "revolutionary ethics," "the revolutionary conscience," which were often widely different, not only from Christianity's higher conception of ethics and conscience, but also from what

usually goes by that name from the ordinary human point of view.

Baron Nicolay was not ignorant of these conditions, and after Dr. Mott's departure he began in his quiet, faithful way, without any vast plans for the future, to give expression to the impulses which the visit had aroused. In the latter part of the summer, while visiting abroad, he carried on an eager correspondence with some of the leaders and workers of the World's Student Christian Federation, among others with the German missionary, Witt. Once a week, during the following winter, the students met in the home of Baron Nicolay for Bible study. The number attending these meetings fluctuated greatly and was never large; even in the second year of the work there were usually only three or four students who attended. Baron Nicolay saw clearly from the first that the movement must begin with the winning of a few individuals. Nevertheless it was discouraging to see how few he was able to reach, especially as he did not succeed during the first years in leading any members of the Bible group to a real decision for Christ, with one exception, a young Polish man who was for long the only converted one among these young people.

Yet from the year 1900 till his death, in 1919, Baron Nicolay attended conference after conference among students. He traveled all over Europe, visited England, and went to Japan and the United States in behalf of the World's Student Christian Federation. Thus by assiduous attention to duty, he succeeded in creating a movement which was destined to live on with increasing vitality.

Such is the life story of the one who was more influential than any other in forming the Russian Student Christian Movement. Traveling the length and breadth of Russia, he nurtured immature beginnings in the souls of students and stimulated a steady flame of endeavor which has survived persecution, revolution, and famine. At the recent meeting of the General Com-



mittee of the World's Student Christian Federation in England the greatest single spiritual contribution came from the Russian delegation. In the personal experience of most of these students there has been a vital spiritual contact with this leader who arose out of the north of Russia to carry forward, in the face of much disappointment, the torch of practical Christianity.

MILTON T. STAUFFER.